DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 438 32 UD 015 470

TITLE	Educational Disadvantage in New Hampshire.
INSTITUTION	Whittemore-Abelson, Concord, N.H.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Education for the Disadvantaged.; New Hampshire State Dept. of Education, Concord. Div. of Instruction.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	116p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Communication Problems; *Educational Disadvantagement; Educational Needs; Family School Relationship; Federal Programs; *Geographic Location; Health Needs; Individual Needs; Minority Group Children; Psychological Needs; *Research Needs; Rural Areas; *School Districts; *Socioeconomic Status; State Surveys; Suburbs; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

This report studies the specific attributes of educational disadvantage which prevent satisfactory achievement in New Hampshire children. It is based on a sample of approximately 10 percent of the state school districts, which are divided into three levels of economic status, three levels of achievement, and an urban, suburban, or rural category. Sections listed are comprised of exhibits that include methodology, educational disadvantage, perception of needs by type of district, and areas for further study. The exhibits are considered to reveal many insights into the elements of disadvantage, the quality of the school-family relationship, the usefulness of current programming for children with special problems, and other subjects. A complex relationship is said to exist between educational disadvantage and levels of economic status and achievement in school districts. Communication problems between school and home, and the tendency by each group to point the finger at the other are listed as findings derived from the study. (AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED114438

EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

By

Whittemore-Abelson

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Whittemore-Abelson
Concord, New Hampshire
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

UD 015470

Copyright Whittemore-Abelson 1975

GOVERNOR OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Meldrim Thomson, Jr.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

DISTRICT NO. 1	LYLE E. HERSOM, GROVETON
DISTRICT NO. 2	JAMES H. HAYES, CONCORD
DISTRICT NO. 3	LEON G. YEATON, DOVER
DISTRICT NO. 4	LOUIS D'ALLESANDRO, MANCHESTER
DISTRICT NO. 5	BERNARD A. STREETER, JR., NASHUA

NEW HAMPSHIRE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
1974-75

APPOINTMENT		TERM EXPIRES
1973	William P. Bittenbender, Deering Chairman	1978
1970	Donald E. Borchers, Berlin	1976
1974	Mrs. Catherine R. Caouette, Contoocook	1979
1965	Gerard F. Cullerot, D.D.S., Manchester	1977
1971	Daniel A. Gosselin, Enfield	1976
1969	Edward C. Sweeney, Jr., Keene	1979
1975	Ivah A. Hackler, Auburn	1980

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Newell J. Paire

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
Robert L. Brunelle

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION
Frank W. Brown, CHIEF

ESEA, TITLE I, OFFICE
Richard B. Hodges, Jr.
Coordinator
Edward G. DeForrest,
Consultant
Mary S. Gile, Consultant
Keith A. Hanscom, Consultant

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Title I ESEA Office, Division of Instruction, New Hampshire State Department of Education, funded under an administrative grant from Title I of P.L. 89:10. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official New Hampshire Department of Education or U. S. Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION....................i

Categories of School Districts - Exhibit 1....................iv

I. CONCLUSIONS....................1

II. METHODOLOGY....................6

Comparative Social and Economic Statistical Indicators By School District - Exhibit 1 - II....................16

Comparative School Achievement Ranks By School District - Exhibit 2 - II....................22

Statistical Summary of School District Groupings and Rankings of Sample School Districts - Exhibit 3 - II....................27

Purpose and Use of Survey - Exhibit 4 - II....................29

Family Characteristics of Parent Sample By Type of School District - Exhibit 5 - II....................30

III. EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE....................32

Social and Economic Statistics By School District - Exhibit 1 - III....................41

Elements of Educational Disadvantage Parents' View - Exhibit 2 - III....................51

Elements of Educational Disadvantage Professionals' View - Exhibit 3 - III....................54

Elements of Educational Disadvantage Comparison of Parental and Professional Views - Exhibit 4 - III....................57

IV. THE PERCEPTION OF NEEDS BY TYPE OF DISTRICT....................60

Educational Disadvantage By Type of School District - Parent Form - Exhibit 1 - IV....................69

Environmental and Health Needs By Type of District - Parent and School Form - Exhibit 2 - IV....................73

Comparative Awareness of Program Availability - Parent Form - Exhibit 3 - IV....................79

Roles of School Personnel By District Parent Form - Exhibit 4 - IV....................81

Preferences in School Programming
Parent Form - Exhibit 5 - IV....................................82

Parental Participation and Support
Parent Form - Exhibit 6 - IV....................................83

Comparative Attitudes By District
Parent Form - Exhibit 7 - IV....................................86

The Professionals' Knowledge of
Special Programs - School Form -
Exhibit 8 - IV..89

Income Distribution of Families
With Children in Special Education
By Type of District - Exhibit 9 - IV.........................90

V. AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY..91

Consideration of a Number of Variables
in Relation to the Number of Children
in Special Education - Parent Form -
Exhibit 1 - V...94

Attitudes Toward the Role of School
Personnel - Exhibit 2 - V...................................95

Views as to Helpfulness of School
Personnel - Parent and School Form -
Exhibit 3 - V...96

Parental Involvement - Exhibit 4 - V.........................98

Appendices

Appendix 1. Parents' Survey Instrument........................100

Appendix 2. Professionals' Survey Instrument..................104

"One of the worst problems is lack of communication . . . Leads to duplication . . . No feedback on cases. Teacher's low man on the totem pole when it comes to being informed about what the other groups do."

---Elementary school teacher in urban area

"The school said 'mind your own business,' and they said she was interfering."

---Answer from a mother of seven with three children in special ed programs when asked how school responded when she attempted to have them respond better to her children's needs.

"Another woman, who, although economically deprived, is aware of her rights and is not afraid to claim them. For that reason, she has had little difficulty in getting the help she needs. Her attitude toward the schools is very positive. There is a positive correlation between her awareness and her attitude."

---Interviewers comments on divorced mother of one who said the schools were "glad to think I was interested" in trying to get them to respond better to her child's needs.

"If this is what it takes to establish contact with parents of disadvantaged children - person-to-person in the parents' own home - then that is what should be done. Her children won't speak up because neither did she when in school. In her case it's a cop-out to say she won't get involved. She isn't able."

---Interviewers comments on divorced mother of three who said "I'm not one to speak out on anything. That was my problem in school too."

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to provide a basis for the planning of future Title I* programming in New Hampshire which takes into account the attributes of educational disadvantage which prevent New Hampshire children from satisfactory achievement in school. A sample of approximately 10 percent of the state's school districts was selected and more than 260 interviews were conducted with school and non-school professionals and parents who have disadvantaged children. The school districts were divided into three levels of economic well-being, three levels of achievement and into urban, suburban and rural categories. The purpose of these groupings was to go beyond the overall description of the phenomenon of educational disadvantage and indicate the specific patterns of need which occur in each type of district.

Local officials are faced with the task of conducting needs assessments upon which to base programming decisions and proposals. This report presents a general set of characteristics which is likely to be present in their particular district.

It is fully recognized that each district and supervisory union has unique characteristics and qualities within its population which are reflected in the attitudes, abilities and levels of attainment of its school population. Many factors which are observable and understood by local citizens are not quantifiable in a statistical sense either because they are difficult to describe in numbers, or because the necessary statistics are not available. In addition, there is a practical limit to the complexity of the survey instrument which if exceeded could result in ill considered answers and inaccurate reporting. For these reasons, no assertion is made that this study is complete or represents the last word in planning assistance for the development of programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children.

In fact, this study represents a beginning, and indicates that with further development and experimentation, better and more useful tools can be developed for the periodic analysis of the specific components of educational disadvantage at given times in given places. To the extent that this study is a sound beginning, programs can be developed which will help disadvantaged youngsters to make the most of their individual capacities and to lead more fulfilled lives.

Exhibit 1 contains lists of the school districts which were judged to be urban and suburban for the purpose of our analysis. All districts not listed were considered rural. We realize that these distinctions will appear in some instances to have been arbitrary. Some of the districts considered to be suburban have larger populations than those considered to be urban. Also, we did not use the term suburban only to describe the "bedroom community" which is close to a large city and thought to be dependent upon it economically. We included in the suburban categories several communities which might be said to have their own economies and not to be dependent for their principal sources of livelihood on adjacent urban areas. In these instances, our use of the term "suburban" simply means a large town or small city which has many of the characteristics of an urban area, but is smaller in population. Some of the school districts considered to be rural also have rather sizable populations. Most were considered rural because they are cooperative school districts made up of several towns with small populations and generally rural economies.

---

*This and each succeeding reference to Title I means Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Exhibit 1 also contains two series of numbers which indicate differences in levels of economic well-being and achievement in the schools of each district. Reference may be made to Exhibits 1 and 2 in Section II in order to identify the standing of each school district in relation to these figures.

Another cautionary word is necessary at this point. Several of the economic indicators used to differentiate between the levels of economic well-being in each school district are based upon figures between two and five years old. Even in more "ordinary" times than these, the use of such a dated statistical base would be undesirable. In these times when the rate of economic activity in several types of business and industry is changing rapidly, school districts are more economically volatile than usual. The achievement comparisons used in this study were based on statewide testing done in the school year 1970-71. Not only were Stanford and Otis scores not available for all school districts, but the passage of time in a period of relatively rapid turnover of educational personnel and increasing mobility of population means that precise rankings of school districts based on these achievement scores are becoming obsolete.

If the types of information generated by the study's application prove to be useful for planning Title I programs as well as for other purposes, the study should be repeated at approximately three to five year intervals using updated economic and achievement information.

A further area for study and refinement is the categorization of school districts. It may be that more precise terms can be applied to New Hampshire districts to facilitate agreement among the public, planning personnel, administrators and Title I program analysts.

These observations are intended to point up that we are still at the beginning stage of the research and survey work needed to bring about a constructive developmental relationship between the real needs of educationally disadvantaged youngsters and programs which will answer these needs.

There are, in this study, significant contributions to understanding this relationship and to expressing it in a sufficiently systematic manner to serve as a useful tool for educational planning purposes. Among these:

- Several economic indicators have been gathered together on a school district basis;
- A method has been developed to construct a sample of New Hampshire school districts representative of parents and professionals in more than 140 other districts;
- It has been shown that there are significant differences of viewpoint in districts with different levels of economic well-being, school achievement, population and location;
- A method has been developed to express these differences in terms of needs, characteristics, attitudes and viewpoints to which programs can be addressed;
- A description and enumeration of the elements which make up educational disadvantage in New Hampshire has been created;
- Avenues of inquiry have been opened which indicate directions for study and research;
- The conclusions of this study are based solidly upon the views of New Hampshire parents and New Hampshire professional personnel, concerned about the specific needs and futures of specific children.

This project also represents a test of the assumption on the part of the authors of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that poverty is the central root of educational disadvantage. The Title I staff and many perceptive educators have been aware of a growing doubt throughout the educational system that this assumption alone accounted for the inability of students to reach levels of achievement consistent with their individual capacities. This doubt has grown into a strong sense of the need to know what professionals and parents concerned with New Hampshire children actually experienced as disadvantage. It is hoped that a broader basis of understanding of educational disadvantage will mean that programs aimed at its alleviation will work.

Exhibit 1

Categories of School Districts

Urban

Berlin
Claremont
Concord
Derry
Dover
Keene
Laconia
Lebanon
Manchester
Nashua
Portsmouth
Rochester
Salem
Somersworth

Suburban

Amherst
Bedford
Exeter
Franklin
Gilford
Goffstown
Hampton
Hanover
Hooksett
Hudson
Littleton
Londonderry
Merrimack
Milford
Newport
Pelham
Pembroke
Rye

Economic Well-Being

Good	0-56
Average	57-84
Poor	85-137

Achievement

Good	190-272
Average	95-189
Poor	0-94

SECTION I

Conclusions

In this section we attempt to set down some of the broad conclusions and patterns of thought which arise from comparison of the material contained in all of the exhibits.

The principal material outcome of this study has been the creation of a body of information of considerable richness and diversity. With the help of the Impress Computer System and Data Processing personnel at Dartmouth College, the answers recorded by interviewers to two long and rather complex survey instruments have been analyzed and compared. The result is the series of exhibits which accompany the text of this report. The exhibits reveal many insights into the thinking of professionals and parents as to the elements of disadvantage, the quality of the school-family relationship, the usefulness of current programming for children with special problems, and other subjects. While there are important areas of agreement and awareness, the survey also shows contradictions and inconsistencies.

Educational Disadvantage

There is educational disadvantage in New Hampshire, and it relates to the levels of economic well-being and achievement in school districts. This relationship is exceedingly complex and comprised of a great many factors, including the incidence of these various elements of disadvantage. Specific variations, described in detail in Section IV of the report, include the following clear observations:

- there is a strong tendency on the part of parents to blame teachers and other professionals if children do not perform well;
- there is an equally strong tendency for professionals to believe that the essential responsibility for lack of satisfactory performance rests in the home;
- there is also a strong disagreement between parents and professionals as to whether various school-home communications devices which are a necessary part of the relationship between school and home are in use.

Thus, the most compelling insights developed during the course of this study are the disagreement over whether the process of communication between school and home is working; and the strong tendency by each group to point the finger at the other - both for causes of problems and communications gaps.

This lack of credibility suggests that improvement in communications between school and home should be recognized as a first priority. Failure to do so presents a considerable potential for hostility, and to the extent hostility exists or develops, it endangers the ability of the child to achieve and sustain satisfactory performance.

There is also a difference in view between the parents and the professionals as to the importance of environmental and health conditions as related to satisfactory school performance. The professionals believe that environmental factors have more negative impact than health deficiences, while parents believe just as strongly that the opposite is true.

In the area of environmental needs, the professionals strongly believe that not having enough good food plays an important part in preventing adequate performance. Combining this observation with the overall concern of the parents for the health of the child, suggests need for development of programs with an emphasis on improved nutrition.

The professionals are united in placing more emphasis on learning disabilities as a cause of educational disadvantage than do the parents.

The parents show particular concern - more so than the professionals - with the use of drugs and alcohol and with the lack of preschool education, as indicators of disadvantage.

Parents and professionals are agreed that vision and hearing deficiencies and emotional and psychological problems very frequently diminish the effectiveness of school performance.

Awareness

Several of the survey questions tested the levels of awareness of the existence of programs designed to help disadvantaged children. The accumulated answers to these questions point to the following conclusions:

- there is significantly less awareness of such programs in areas that are rural, poor and have low levels of school achievement;
- there is a much stronger feeling that help which is needed is not available in school districts that are rural, poor and low in achievement;
- conversely, there is more confidence that there are sources of help available outside the school system in areas that are urban, poor and low in achievement;
- there is a much stronger awareness of specific programs to help disadvantaged children in suburban school districts that have high levels of economic well-being and achievement;
- there is much more use of available special programs in suburban school districts that rate good in economy and achievement, and much less use made of such programs in rural areas that rate poorly in economy and achievement.

The Roles of School Personnel

The analyses of roles of school personnel by the parents' sample indicates that the classroom teacher, the school principal and, to a much lesser extent, the guidance counselor, are the only types of school professionals who receive much recognition of the relevance of their activities to the needs of disadvantaged children.

Program Needs

When asked to indicate needed areas of improvement in school program, the parents showed a strong belief in the efficacy of special classes for disadvantaged youngsters. But they also indicated that the schools should place more emphasis on basic practical education in areas such as reading.

Participation and Support

Comparative levels of parental participation and involvement with the education of disadvantaged youngsters brought forth answers leading to these conclusions:

- the highest rate of parental participation is in suburban school districts which are well off economically and have a high level of achievement;
- parents place much more reliance than do professionals on the value of supportive activities in the home in improving school performance.

Attitudinal Differences

Several questions on each of the survey instruments attempted to gauge attitudinal differences in the various types of school districts. Three pronounced comparative patterns of attitude were revealed. These patterns can be described by reference to the locations of the districts in which they occur - suburban, urban and rural.

Suburban school districts which, compared to all other districts, are strong economically and show a good level of achievement in test results:

- place great importance on the learning of a trade or work skill;
- place less importance on making good grades in school than on studying;
- do not give high priority to preparation for college;
- demonstrate less knowledge on the part of their professional personnel as to how special programs for disadvantaged youngsters have been developed or funded and whether federal funds have been useful in this area.

A second pattern of attitudes is revealed in those urban school districts which rate poorly economically and in achievement. In these districts:

- there is strong support for the importance of preparation for college;
- there is less emphasis on the importance of learning a trade or work skill;
- there is more feeling that the attitude of disadvantaged children toward the schools is positive;
- there is more knowledge amongst professionals as to how special programs are developed and funded.

The third attitudinal pattern is revealed in rural school districts where the levels of economic well-being and achievement are poor. In these districts:

- there is a clear belief that learning to get along with others is one of the most important outcomes of a child's schooling;
- there is less emphasis on the importance of learning a trade or work skill than in suburban areas;
- there is more import placed on college preparation than in suburban areas;
- there is less feeling that families with disadvantaged youngsters are viewed as being "different" by the schools;
- there is stronger feeling that the attitudes of the schools toward a disadvantaged child is positive.

In both types of rural and urban school districts mentioned above - where economic and achievement levels are comparatively low - there is a greater belief that federal funds have been useful in support programs for disadvantaged youngsters than there is in suburban districts with high economic and achievement levels.

Participation in Special Education

Another interesting series of conclusions has to do with the question of the comparative incomes of families whose children are involved in special education programs. All the families queried were divided into two economic groups - those with family incomes of over $5,500 a year and those whose incomes were less. A comparison of how these two groups broke down in each type of school district shows:

- in districts with good and average levels of economic well-being, more families with incomes over $5,500 have children in special education programs;

- in districts that are poor economically, more families with incomes of less than $5,500 have children in special education;
- in districts with good and average achievement, more families with incomes higher than $5,500 have children in special education programs;
- in school districts with a low level of achievement, there are more families with children in special education who have incomes less than $5,500;
- in urban and suburban school districts, families with incomes of over $5,500 are more likely to have children in special education than low income families;
- in rural areas, the lower income families are more likely to have children in special education programs.

SECTION II
METHODOLOGY

Preparation of Instruments

In preparing the two instruments (Appendix 1 and 2), a number of issues had to be faced and several factors taken into account.

First, there was the charge given us by Title I, Department of Education, as described in the Introduction of this document. We must design questionnaires which would elicit the desired information, but at the same time - recognizing the paucity of existing research in this area - leave enough flexibility to allow additional important issues to surface. We must determine what kinds of people would be questioned, what kinds of people should question the interviewees and what shape the questions should take.

Once having decided upon the construction of the instruments, we must determine what correlations, if any, should exist between the two questionnaires and conversely, what questions should be exclusive to each document.

One early decision was to construct two separate questionnaires. One would be aimed exclusively at parents and the other at a variety of professionals, including school administrators, teachers, guidance personnel, nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, physicians and others having contact with children and/or the families of children having problems in school. (For purposes of this report, the instruments are designated "P" for parents and"S" for all others.)

Another early decision reached was that the information needed for the purposes set forth in the charge could not be gleaned from a brief, uni-purpose questionnaire. A series of direct and probing questions was needed, designed to bring forth the actual needs as seen by the interviewee, the degree to which the needs were seen as being met, or not met, the kinds of things identified as constituting "disadvantage", and situations and attitudes which may weigh upon the disadvantaged child.

The instruments are the result of several refinements following consultation with Title I personnel, educators and a brief field test. It was recognized in advance, and even more so in retrospect, that the responses would include information a) beyond the ability to deal with in one, limited-sized report, and b) beyond the scope of the charge. Still, it was decided to err on the side of obtaining more information than would be used - again having in mind the lack of data in this field in New Hampshire.

A perusal of the questionnaires will demonstrate the various factors outlined above. For example, Question 1 in each instrument is designed to elicit a picture of the "disadvantaged" child, but to receive the picture separately through the eyes of parents and of professionals.

Also, Questions 10 through 15 on "P" are equivalent to Questions 11 through 16 on "S". These parallel questions serve at least two purposes - they provide quantitative answers to questions which either follow up on or expand upon earlier queries in each questionnaire, and also provide rich material for quantitatively comparing the perceptions of the two groups questioned. Questions 17 and 19 and, to a lesser degree, Question 18 on both "P" and "S" provide the same opportunities.

On the other hand, on the"P" questionnaire, Questions 9c through 9i provide exclusive information on characteristics of families of interviewees, while Question 16 provides the parental view of the importance of specific student achievements. An example of specificity on the "S" instrument is Question 8 which deals with development and funding of special programming.

We believe that only the results of the survey, as detailed later in this document, can determine the validity of the questionnaires and the way in which the interviews were conducted (see next section). It is not an apology to state that questions are not solutions. But at the same time, it is abundantly clear that questions, honestly constructed and sincerely asked of those most affected, can be the vehicles to carry on from the problem to the solution.

Deriving the Sample

The purpose of this section is to describe the process by which a representative sampling of 16 school districts was selected for the conduct of the field survey phase of this study. First, population groupings were developed which would represent all districts from the largest to the most rural. Secondly, it was necessary to ensure that comparisons of the responses of interviewees to the survey instruments could be compared to illustrate meaningful differences. This was accomplished by gathering statistics upon which to base an economic and social ranking of all districts, as well as developing a comparative school achievement ranking. The final selection of the sample was, as will be seen, based upon representative social and economic rankings within population groupings of districts.

Population

There are several alternative methods available for comparing the population of school districts in the State of New Hampshire. Three population indicators were compared in order to select the population figures used in preparing this study. These were the standard projection for 1972 made from the 1970 federal census figures for the United States Census Bureau; a projection derived by extrapolation from "Population Projections of New Hampshire" prepared by Anderson Nichols and Company, Inc.; and the estimates of resident population prepared annually by the Office of State Planning.

After comparison of these three projections for the years 1971, 1972 and 1973 it was decided for two reasons to use the estimate of the Office of State Planning for the year 1972. The percent of deviation between all three indicators was smallest in 1972, and several of the social and economic indicators were obtainable for 1972 but not for 1973.

Two other series of comparative population figures were used to derive school district population rankings; the estimate of the civilian labor force 16 years of age and over from the 1970 census, and the estimates of total population between the ages of 5 and 17 from the same source.

When rankings based on population, civilian labor force and school age population were derived it was possible to compile an overall ranking of all school districts. On this basis six population groups of districts were chosen which were representative of all districts from the most urban to the most rural.

It is notable here that Group I was made up of Manchester and Nashua which had more than 20 percent of the state's estimated population in 1972. In contrast, Group VI with 67 school districts contained only 7.3 percent of the state's 1972 population. It should be noted that because of the many cooperative school districts combining a number of small communities, the districts in the middle population groups do not necessarily represent the smaller urban or larger suburban districts.

Exhibit 3 shows the population range of each group of districts and the percentage of the total state population in the group. It also shows the number of school districts in each group. Some districts in Group VI have a higher population than districts in Group V because the civilian labor force and the population 5 to 17 were taken into account in grouping districts, in addition to the estimated number of residents.

The number of interviewees in each district was also selected on the basis of population. Thus, the number of people interviewed in each group was determined by the percentage of total state population residing in each group.

Social and Economic Indicators and Their Sources

Eight series of social and economic statistical* indicators were developed for the purpose of ranking the general level of individual and family well-being by school district.

The rankings derived from these series of statistical indicators are included in Exhibit 1. The sources of the rankings are as follows:

1. Percent of Work Force Unemployed - The figures upon which these ranks were based were prepared by the Reports and Analysis Section of the New Hampshire Department of Employment Security and were reported by Local Office Area. In

---

*hereinafter referred to as SES

the "New Hampshire Annual Manpower Planning Report, Fiscal Year 1975" the recorded unemployment percentages for a representative six month period were averaged to arrive at a percentage for each of the ten Local Office Areas. This percentage was used as an estimate of the percent of work force unemployed for each school district within the Local Office Area. The fact that there were only ten Local Office Areas accounts for the small number of different ranking levels. This factor, of course, makes these rankings too general to be used as accurate economic indicators by themselves. In instances where school district boundaries crossed, Local Office boundaries weighted averages based on population were computed. Generalized figures of this sort have been used in more than one of our social and economic indicators. We claim validity for such figures only when they are considered as adding to the overall validity of a series of specific and nonspecific indicators.

2. The Yearly Average Incomes of Weekly Wage Earners in Private Industry*- The figures upon which these rankings were based were also compiled for this study by the Reports and Analysis Section of the Department of Employment Security. They are based on the average weekly wages earned during the third quarter of 1972 and projected for the year to form the basis for ranks. We are indebted to the staff of the Reports and Analysis Section for the special effort involved in producing these figures.

3. Years of Education Completed by Adults - These figures are from the publication "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire - Research Report No. 25 New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station July 1972". The rankings are based on comparisons of the percentages of persons in each county who had a first to eighth grade education, an education that stopped at or below the third year in high school, a complete high school education or who had attended college. Since these figures were available on a county-by-county basis, the rankings in this series are also generalized. Each school district received the comparative rank ascribed to its own county unless its boundaries crossed those of another county.

   The rankings between counties reflect favorably upon those in which a larger percentage of the adult population had completed high school or attended college.

4. Orshansky Percentages - These figures represent percentages of children age 5 to 17 residing in each school district who lived in families listed as poor in the 1970 census report.

5. Public Aid Per Capita - These rankings are based on comparative expenditures in each school district during the calendar year 1972 for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Aid to Families with Dependent Children Foster Care, Direct Relief Administered by Local Governments and Foster Care Payments Made by Local Governments. Direct Relief to Single Persons as well as other non-child related public assistance such as Old Age Assistance are excluded. The total sums expended were divided by the population of each school district to

---

*Averages of wages reported - not all wages.

derive comparative rankings for this study.

We are indebted to the Reports and Analysis Section of the New Hampshire Division of Welfare for the extra study required to accumulate these figures.

6. Families With Income Under $4,000 - "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire", referred to under Number 3, and 1970 census data were used for these rankings.

7. Housing Lacking Basic Facilities - These figures were also taken from "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire" and represent an estimate of the percentage of housing lacking toilets, plumbing or kitchen facilities.

8. Median Family Income - These figures are based on 1970 census information but were compiled on a school district basis for this survey by the Reports and Analysis Section of the Department of Employment Security.

In addition to the rankings determined from the eight series of figures described above, Exhibit 1 also contains an average rank for each school district and an average rank within each group of school districts.

Achievement*

Exhibit 2 contains rankings by school district based on differences in mean Stanford Achievement Scores and Otis Test Scores for grades 2, 4, 6 and 8 taken from the "School Testing Program Report" for the school year 1970-1971. The mean Stanford Achievement Scores result from a comparison of achievement by school districts in all areas measured by ability testing. These were combined with Otis Intelligence Test Scores for the same school districts to form an achievement ranking for each district. It was not possible to develop rankings for all school districts since some Achievement Scores were not available. Since mean scores were available for more than three quarters of the school districts in the state, however, this factor did not prevent interviewing in a fully representative sampling of districts.

The rankings based on Stanford and Otis Scores were added to develop an achievement point ranking for each district. The achievement point ranking for all districts within each population group was then averaged.

Final Sample District Selection

Exhibit 3, in addition to the information referred to previously, also contains the group average SES and Achievement ranks resulting from the application of Exhibits 1 and 2. It will be noted that in contrast to the SES rankings in which a low rank represents a more satisfactory social and economic community performance, in the case of Achievement a higher score represents a higher district performance.

---

*See explanation accompanying Exhibit 2.

The final selection of sixteen representative school districts was made to provide a district in each group of districts which had a favorable, an average and an unfavorable SES ranking as compared to the group average, and a high, average and low Achievement ranking as compared to the group average. (This was not done in Group I, which contained only two school districts.) This method avoided the selection of a group of districts so similar that differences in the level of social and economic performance within the total sample could not be tested in relation to contrasting Achievement Scores.

The Subject Group

It was planned to interview approximately 250 persons in the sixteen districts. Actually, 189 members of families containing disadvantaged youngsters, and 72 school and non-school professionals were interviewed.

The sample size was such to allow between 40 minutes and an hour for each interview.

Conducting the Survey

Once the instruments had been prepared and tested and the sample to be questioned had been selected, the way was clear to begin the field survey. However, prior preparation and planning had been done since the survey essentially broke down into two main parts:

1. Developing methodology
2. Field implementation

A high priority must be placed upon the quality of the field interviewers. This is particularly true when dealing with a complex subject, an extensive set of questions, and a group of interviewees - both parents and professionals - whose sensitivity and awareness must be recognized and respected. For these reasons, all of the field workers were personally interviewed at length by the contractors. Of those selected, five were experienced interviewers with media backgrounds and the sixth was thoroughly acquainted with the project from its inception.

All of the interviewers underwent a training session conducted by the contractors and their behavioral-educational consultant, under the director of the Field Coordinator.

The charge of the project, the two questionnaires, the method of selecting the sample, the proposed use of the responses, the need to keep closely in touch with the Field Coordinator - all these things were carefully covered in the training session.

Next, the sixteen school districts to be covered were broken down into five geographical areas for ease of coverage and assignment. Individual interviewers were given daily assignments, including locations of key interviewees. The contractor also prepared and provided the interviewers with a brief document "Purpose and Use of Survey" (Exhibit 4), and instructed them to make certain each person to be questioned read it and understood the questionnaire and the general purpose of gathering the information.

During the course of the survey, the Field Supervisor kept in frequent communication with the interviewers. Additionally, the interviewers periodically dropped off bundles of completed questionnaires with the contractor. In this way, personal contact was maintained with the interviewers, and the Field Supervisor was able to check the results to make certain the purposes of the survey were kept in mind and that questions or problems were dealt with promptly.

The Nature of the Sample

In this section we discuss briefly:

The categories in terms of SES ranking, Achievement and Urban, Suburban or Rural status of the selected districts;

The numbers of respondents to the survey who were interviewed in each type of district;

The occupations of professional respondents; and

An analysis of the characteristics of the parents selected

Where percentages are used in some of the following exhibits or tables, rounding errors have occurred and account for totals not equaling 100.

The School Districts

The following table shows the breakdown of districts described above.

	SES Scores			Achievement Rank		
	Good SES	Average SES	Poor SES	Good Achievement	Average Achievement	Poor Achievemen
Urban						
Manchester		X			X	
Dover		X			X	
Concord		X		X		
Salem	X				X	
Berlin			X			X
Laconia		X			X	
Suburban						
Merrimack	X				X	
Bedford	X			X		
Bow	X			X		
Rural						
Mascoma Valley			X			X
Sanborn Regional		X			X	
Gorham			X			X
Mascenic Regional		X				X
Unity			X			X
Stoddard			X			X
Brentwood	X			X		

Following is a breakdown of all the respondents to the survey in the same categories.

Sample Status

Type of District		Percentage
Urban	135	51.7
Suburban	47	18.0
Rural	79	30.3

SES Score - Socioeconomic Status of District		Percentage
Good	65	24.9
Average	133	51.0
Poor	63	24.1

Achievement Score of District		Percentage
Good	47	18.0
Average	137	52.5
Poor	77	29.5

The table below shows the breakdown of the occupations of professional respondents.

		Percentage
Administrators	18	25.0
Teachers	12	16.7
Special Teachers	11	15.3
Guidance Counselors	10	13.9
Nurses	8	11.1
Non-School Professionals	13	18.1

The Parent Sample

Questions 9c through 9i on the parent interview form were designed to reveal the characteristics of the families interviewed, as demonstrated by the next table.

Family Characteristics of Parent Sample

9c. Number of children at home?

0-3	Percentage	4 or More	Percentage	No Answer
77	41.2	110	58.8	2

9d. Number of school-age children?

0-3	Percentage	4 or More	Percentage	No Answer
104	55.2	84	44.8	1

9e. Number of children involved in special educational programs?

None	Percentage	Some	Percentage	No Answer
85	45.5	102	54.5	2

9f. How many parents live at home?

One	Percentage	Two	Percentage	No Answer
62	32.8	127	67.2	0

9g1. Mother's years of education?

0-8	Percentage	9-11	Percentage	12 or Over	Percentage
50	26.6	63	33.5	75	39.9

No Answer
1

9g2. Father's years of education?

0-8	Percentage	9-11	Percentage	12 or Over	Percentage
47	32.4	51	35.2	47	32.4

No Answer
44

9h1. Mother employed?

Employed	Percentage	Not Employed	Percentage	No Answer
68	36.9	119	63.1	2

9h2. Father employed?

Employed	Percentage	Not Employed	Percentage	No Answer
135	92.5	11	7.5	43

9i. Yearly income range?

$0-$5500	Percentage	$5500 or Over	Percentage	Don't Know No Answer
70	40.0	105	60.0	14

Exhibit 5 breaks down the answers to the same questions by SES district, Achievement districts, and Urban, Suburban or Rural districts.

The last table in this section shows a further breakdown of family income ranges within the sample. In the yearly income range breakdown among types of districts, the family income rating of those families earning under $5,500 and over $5,500 has been used to prepare for a number of exhibits which will be used in Part II of the study to indicate differences in answers between very low income groups and low income groups.

Income Range		
$0-$2,500	4	2.3
$2,500-$4,000	32	18.3
$4,000-$5,500	34	19.4
$5,500-$7,000	64	36.6
$7,000 and Over	41	23.4
Excluded - No Answer	14	
Totals	189	100.0

A further word is necessary with regard to the process of identifying interviewees. Title I personnel were asked to identify a key person in each school district who might be interviewed by a member of the field survey team. They included administrators, teachers, guidance counselors and in some instances persons directly involved in the administration of the Title I program. They were asked to assist the interviewer in a preliminary identification of knowledgeable school and non-school professionals. These professionals when interviewed were asked to identify a small number of low income families with disadvantaged children. Other non-school persons with knowledge of the family and community life of the area were identified and also assisted in obtaining the names of additional families and professionals to be interviewed.

The field survey team was carefully instructed to avoid the kind of repetitive categorical selection of interviewees which might have introduced bias into the results of the survey. In this way an attempt was made to use multiple criteria for selecting interviewees. We are aware that this process possibly may have resulted in the identification of unrepresentative respondents in some instances. However, we believe that the sample is large enough so that these instances could not seriously affect the value of the study results.

Analysis of Field Survey Results

When the field survey was completed a team of coding personnel was selected and trained to breakdown the answers to the questions contained in the respective instruments in order to achieve compatibility with the Kiewit Impress Problem Solving Computer System at Dartmouth College. When a complete coding manual had been compiled by this process all of the results of the field survey were entered into the Impress Data Analysis System. Our programming and data analysis consultant then generated the information and tables used in this report.

EXHIBIT 1 - II

Comparative Social and Economic Statistical Indicators By School District

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed*	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults*	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Group I										59.7
Manchester	88	31	80	27	152	77	30	70	69.3**	
Nashua	88	15	80	19	125	34	16	24	50.1	
Group II										59.6
Concord	66	35	64	28	141	59	24	45	57.7	
Dover	112	47	128	27	140	42	20	55	71.3	
Keene	88	26	96	30	136	63	24	47	62.5	
Portsmouth	78	60	32	4	163	89	22	111	69.9	
Salem	88	39	32	9	90	14	7	15	36.7	
Group III										64.0
Berlin	152	22	160	29	143	131	32	129	99.7	
Claremont	90	53	144	22	123	93	28	101	81.7	
Contoocook Valley Regional	82	43	80	14	92	59	81	48	62.3	
Derry	88	68	32	32	133	80	36	34	62.9	
Goffstown	88	75	80	11	51	49	14	38	50.7	
Hudson	88	83	80	17	78	6	4	14	46.2	
Laconia	90	54	96	16	148	73	28	53	69.7	
Lebanon	90	52	48	23	114	86	20	88	65.1	
Merrimack	88	13	80	14	66	4	10	11	35.7	
Monadnock Regional	88	64	96	39	115	96	104	95	87.1	
Rochester	112	92	128	30	142	90	41	103	92.2	
Somersworth	112	51	128	29	127	80	13	51	73.9	
Timberlane Regional	78	71	32	21	100	30	44	16	49.0	
Group IV										58.5
Amherst	88	84	80	28	21	31	63	5	50.0	
Bedford	88	121	80	7	27	7	16	8	44.2	
Conway	152	106	16	30	117	80	116	127	93.0	
Exeter	78	30	32	4	124	67	32	71	54.7	
Fall Mountain Regional	88	36	122	20	73	91	93	113	79.5	
Franklin	66	72	64	31	158	99	67	80	79.6	

* The small numbers of rank orders in these columns result from the figures being available on an employment office or county basis.

**Please note that districts with lower average ranks have a higher level of economic well-being.

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Gov. Wentworth Regional	94	114	26	36	99	32	116	107	78.0	
Hampton	78	32	32	23	85	58	11	31	43.7	
Hanover	90	14	48	4	18	37	41	3	31.9	
Hooksett	88	12	64	34	47	63	36	39	47.9	
Inter-lakes Coop.	90	74	80	38	119	76	102	84	82.9	
Jaffrey-Rindge Coop.	88	81	96	31	77	71	57	60	70.1	
Kearsarge Regional	82	90	72	6	76	107	123	133	86.1	
Littleton	164	78	48	16	151	19	49	139	83.0	
Londonderry	88	18	32	32	83	15	36	42	43.2	
Mascoma Valley Regional	90	139	48	28	146	99	139	118	100.9	
Merrimack Valley	66	37	64	35	26	71	99	91	61.1	
Milford	88	40	80	32	104	54	20	50	58.5	
Newfound Area	90	41	56	43	111	122	134	115	89.0	
Newport	90	62	144	48	110	66	84	93	87.1	
Oyster River Coop.	112	102	128	12	46	87	33	12	66.5	
Pembroke	66	50	64	27	123	39	30	54	56.6	
Sanborn Regional	78	88	32	18	33	82	60	92	60.3	
White Mountain Regional	164	97	160	32	126	112	75	141	100.8	
Winnisquam Regional	90	42	83	33	145	106	77	118	86.7	
Group V										
Allenstown	66	118	64	16	121	41	20	63	63.6	64.4
Alton	90	144	96	1	45	137	140	146	99.9	
Ashland	90	20	48	37	147	100	54	98	74.2	
Auburn	88	24	32	18	75	38	84	68	53.3	
Barrington	112	94	128	26	42	68	101	56	78.4	
Bow	66	5	64	0	23	3	52	10	31.8	
Candia	88	82	32	23	30	11	91	67	53.0	
Chester	88	85	32	16	122	116	76	65	75.0	
Chesterfield	88	69	96	13	69	22	66	66	61.1	
Colebrook	152	104	160	122	154	125	93	138	131.0	
Cornish	90	122	144	26	28	54	46	108	77.2	

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Deerfield	66	34	32	30	43	99	126	41	58.9	
Epping	78	107	32	33	151	28	86	106	77.6	
Epsom	66	33	64	7	130	34	113	81	66.0	
Farmington	112	38	128	43	137	82	79	98	89.6	
Gilford	90	76	96	4	22	49	10	13	45.0	
Gorham	152	136	160	31	156	101	157	119	126.5	
Hampstead	78	108	32	0	74	29	44	59	60.6	
Haverhill Coop.	164	111	48	36	153	103	80	132	103.4	
Henniker	66	55	64	48	52	126	139	126	84.5	
Hillsboro-Deering	66	70	80	11	105	76	101	105	76.7	
Hinsdale	88	95	96	39	129	64	52	77	80.0	
Hollis	88	128	80	52	20	141	38	33	72.5	
Hopkinton	66	7	64	2	16	18	69	6	31.0	
Lincoln-Woodstock Coop.	164	49	48	37	134	54	60	128	84.2	
Lisbon Regional	164	120	48	71	71	151	131	18	96.7	
Litchfield	88	149	80	0	40	6	7	17	55.3	
Marlboro	88	135	96	13	131	24	99	87	84.1	
Mascenic Regional	88	23	80	25	116	56	89	49	65.7	
Milton	112	66	128	8	67	120	149	121	96.4	
New Boston	88	1	80	27	90	44	106	23	57.4	
Newmarket	112	73	32	29	135	96	44	108	67.4	
North Hampton	78	77	32	20	53	66	2	25	44.1	
Northumberland	152	19	160	24	118	89	75	122	94.9	
Northwood	66	132	32	0	120	108	94	112	94.8	
Pittsfield	66	63	64	31	144	50	99	110	78.4	
Plainfield	90	56	144	13	81	28	61	75	68.5	
Plymouth	90	99	48	40	149	113	58	104	87.6	
Raymond	88	119	32	27	157	114	73	117	90.9	
Rollinsford	112	101	128	20	101	54	28	44	73.5	
Rye	78	123	32	31	57	92	3	26	55.2	
Seabrook	78	27	32	41	160	49	79	73	67.4	
Shaker Regional	84	80	88	17	58	44	90	86	68.4	
Stratham	78	17	32	41	87	132	28	62	59.6	
Sunapee	90	113	144	44	31	133	71	130	94.5	

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Wakefield	112	105	16	48	161	136	109	150	104.6	
Weare	88	79	80	0	96	1	127	43	73.4	
Wilton	88	48	80	40	128	117	48	123	84.0	
Winchester	88	28	96	12	159	21	105	96	75.6	
Windham	88	21	32	19	80	2	38	9	36.1	
Group VI										83.1
Albany	152	150	16	85	17	161	160	162	112.9	
Andover	66	133	64	20	82	19	120	36	67.5	
Barnstead	66	87	96	59	98	118	108	79	88.9	
Bartlett	152	116	16	33	107	105	53	126	88.5	
Bath	164	0	48	0	39	150	103	159	110.5	
Benton	164	0	48	160	1	148	159	163	120.4	
Bethlehem	164	137	48	0	65	21	22	30	69.6	
Brentwood	78	44	32	21	13	18	86	83	46.9	
Brookline	88	100	80	21	85	63	66	58	70.1	
Campton	90	65	48	19	93	69	73	76	66.6	
Chatham	152	0	16	0	1	158	129	161	102.8	
Chichester	88	69	64	40	32	85	111	102	73.9	
Clarksville	152	0	160	31	1	159	120	144	97.1	
Columbia	152	0	160	11	1	11	146	140	88.7	
Croydon	90	146	144	0	1	110	154	152	113.8	
Dummer	152	0	160	0	35	153	163	157	136.7	
Dunbarton	66	141	64	40	37	73	71	69	70.1	
East Kingston	78	61	32	35	84	14	48	40	49.0	
Eaton	152	126	16	0	19	162	137	117	104.1	
Errol	152	29	160	0	162	155	153	82	127.6	
Freedom	90	152	16	50	106	139	133	158	104.2	
Fremont	78	127	32	4	155	104	108	78	85.7	
Gilmanton	90	117	96	59	55	154	144	100	101.9	
Goshen-Lempster Coop.	90	147	144	55	59	143	129	154	115.1	
Grantham	90	9	144	86	87	144	124	135	102.4	
Hampton Falls	78	57	32	32	38	12	24	28	37.6	
Harrisville	88	6	96	0	89	134	142	147	100.3	

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Hill	66	130	64	0	139	129	113	85	103.7	
Holderness	90	142	48	7	12	85	66	142	74.0	
Jackson	152	89	16	76	36	136	56	74	79.4	
Kensington	78	11	32	10	24	127	68	61	51.4	
Lafayette Regional	164	11	48	113	94	160	99	99	98.5	
Landaff	164	148	48	54	60	85	152	27	92.2	
Lyme	90	109	48	7	62	25	126	89	69.5	
Lyndeborough	88	86	80	0	49	41	136	7	69.6	
Madison	152	46	16	50	29	142	89	94	77.2	
Marlow	88	106	96	0	63	103	159	149	109.1	
Middleton	112	0	128	46	15	147	155	144	106.7	
Milan	152	91	160	19	112	9	141	131	101.9	
Monroe	164	2	48	0	44	116	82	46	71.7	
Mont Vernon	88	96	80	0	108	24	63	19	68.3	
Nelson	88	153	96	0	148	125	151	155	116.6	
New Castle	78	112	32	4	1	76	7	4	39.2	
Newfields	112	59	32	11	97	16	52	29	51.0	
Newington	78	10	32	7	138	59	56	37	52.1	
Nottingham	112	110	32	29	56	125	130	136	92.5	
Orford	164	8	48	9	41	46	133	109	69.7	
Piermont	164	145	48	94	25	96	123	135	103.7	
Pittsburg	152	124	160	52	95	60	150	148	117.6	
Randolph	152	151	160	0	79	152	48	124	123.7	
Rumney	90	125	48	31	63	121	114	114	88.2	
Shelburne	156	152	160	24	1	156	135	90	109.2	
South Hampton	78	3	32	54	1	129	41	35	46.6	
Stark	152	0	160	90	113	28	111	160	116.3	
Stewartstown	152	98	160	89	102	138	121	137	124.6	
Stoddard	88	134	96	0	54	37	143	56	86.8	
Strafford	112	138	128	0	50	141	117	63	107.0	
Stratford	152	25	160	116	164	146	161	156	135.0	
Tamworth	152	131	16	52	34	146	116	164	101.4	
Thornton	164	129	48	95	1	149	148	151	110.6	
Unity	90	0	144	0	14	157	145	145	115.8	
Warren	90	143	48	0	132	111	147	153	117.7	

Groups	Percent Of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income	Years Of Education Completed By Adults	Orshansky Percentage	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income	Average Rank Per School District	Average Group Rank
Warren	90	143	48	0	132	111	147	153	117.7	
Washington	90	45	144	85	68	35	162	32	82.6	
Waterville Valley	164	16	48	87	1	46	0	1	60.5	
Wentworth	90	67	48	0	103	0	156	72	89.3	
Westmoreland	88	93	96	30	72	110	99	52	80.0	
Windsor	66	58	80	0	1	0	89	21	52.5	

EXHIBIT 2 - II

Comparative School Achievement Ranks by School District*

Groups	Stanford Achievement Scores**	Otis Scores**	Achievement Points	Average Group Score
Group I				192.5
Manchester	91	86	177***	
Nashua	117	91	208	
Group II				208
Concord	120	139	259	
Dover	91	85	176	
Keene	96	117	213	
Portsmouth	116	111	227	
Salem	88	77	165	
Group III				167.7
Berlin	46	29	75	
Claremont	105	96	201	
Contoocook Valley Regional	123	126	249	
Derry	98	92	190	
Goffstown	118	108	226	
Hudson	65	82	147	
Laconia	84	83	167	
Lebanon	68	94	162	
Merrimack	73	107	180	
Monadnock Regional	26	32	58	
Rochester	103	100	203	
Somersworth	0	0	0	
Timberlane Regional	61	93	154	
Group IV				142.6
Amherst	127	131	258	
Bedford	112	125	237	
Conway	124	109	233	
Exeter	114	121	235	
Fall Mountain Regional	100	110	210	
Franklin	55	50	105	
Governor Wentworth Regional	57	58	115	
Hampton	133	127	260	
Hanover	0	0	0	

*These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

**School districts with zero are those for which test scores were not available.

***Please note that districts with higher Achievement scores have higher levels of achievement.

Groups	Stanford Achievement Scores	Otis Scores	Achievement Points	Average Group Score
Hooksett	1	2	3	
Inter-lakes Coop.	99	89	188	
Jaffrey-Rindge Coop.	0	0	0	
Kearsarge Regional	108	119	227	
Littleton	33	51	84	
Londonderry	0	0	0	
Mascoma Valley Regional	25	33	58	
Merrimack Valley Regional	16	31	47	
Milford	86	97	183	
Newfound Area	52	24	76	
Newport	54	43	97	
Oyster River Coop.	0	0	0	
Pembroke	63	90	153	
Sanborn Regional	101	70	171	
White Mountain Regional	48	47	95	
Winnisquam Regional	38	37	75	
Group V				139
Allenstown	49	57	106	
Alton	23	21	44	
Ashland	87	61	148	
Auburn	0	0	0	
Barrington	56	66	122	
Bow	129	138	267	
Candia	45	68	113	
Chester	0	0	0	
Chesterfield	58	78	136	
Colebrook	80	40	120	
Cornish	107	81	188	
Deerfield	18	30	48	
Epping	30	36	66	
Epsom	67	56	123	
Farmington	36	34	70	
Gilford	119	122	241	
Gorham	34	41	75	
Hampstead	136	136	272	
Haverhill Coop.	0	0	0	

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

Groups	Stanford Achievement Scores	Otis Scores	Achievement Points	Average Group Score
Henniker	106	128	234	
Hillsboro-Deering	81	102	183	
Hinsdale	35	49	84	
Hollis	131	135	148	
Hopkinton	111	115	226	
Lincoln-Woodstock Coop.	134	104	238	
Lisbon Regional	0	0	0	
Litchfield	0	28	28	
Marlboro	125	120	245	
Mascenic Regional	70	55	125	
Milton	77	73	150	
New Boston	22	27	49	
Newmarket	122	105	227	
North Hampton	0	0	0	
Northumberland	64	35	99	
Northwood	15	45	60	
Pittsfield	78	84	162	
Plainfield	71	64	135	
Plymouth	135	130	265	
Raymond	39	39	78	
Rollinsford	0	0	0	
Rye	0	0	0	
Seabrook	0	0	0	
Shaker Regional	47	37	84	
Stratham	62	98	160	
Sunapee	110	80	190	
Wakefield	41	25	66	
Weare	17	5	22	
Wilton	115	114	229	
Winchester	7	10	17	
Windham	0	0	0	
Group VI				117
Albany	0	0	0	
Andover	59	54	113	
Barnstead	0	20	20	
Bartlett	109	116	225	

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

Groups	Stanford Achievement Scores	Otis Scores	Achievement Points	Average Group Score
Bath	79	95	174	
Benton	0	0	0	
Bethlehem	74	65	139	
Brentwood	95	103	198	
Brookline	75	112	187	
Campton	21	11	32	
Chatham	0	0	0	
Chichester	50	59	109	
Clarksville	0	0	0	
Columbia	0	0	0	
Croydon	18	63	81	
Dummer	0	0	0	
Dunbarton	97	62	159	
East Kingston	138	124	262	
Eaton	0	0	0	
Errol	113	99	212	
Freedom	126	113	239	
Fremont	24	13	37	
Gilmanton	60	76	136	
Goshen-Lempster Coop.	43	42	85	
Grantham	3	8	11	
Hampton Falls	0	0	0	
Harrisville	19	26	45	
Hill	28	17	45	
Holderness	85	75	160	
Jackson	102	129	231	
Kensington	29	79	108	
Lafayette Regional	0	0	0	
Landaff	2	1	3	
Lyme	0	0	0	
Lyndeborough	66	71	137	
Madison	37	22	59	
Marlow	4	3	7	
Middleton	0	0	0	
Milan	6	9	15	
Monroe	137	134	271	
Mont Vernon	130	140	270	
Nelson	128	137	265	

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

Groups	Stanford Achievement Scores	Otis Scores	Achievement Points	Average Group Score
New Castle	0	0	0	
Newfields	40	72	112	
Newington	0	0	0	
Nottingham	11	15	26	
Orford	42	44	86	
Piermont	94	88	182	
Pittsburg	72	23	95	
Randolph	0	0	0	
Rumney	44	48	92	
Shelburne	0	0	0	
South Hampton	0	0	0	
Stark	76	38	114	
Stewartstown	14	6	20	
Stoddard	10	7	17	
Strafford	69	46	115	
Stratford	5	4	9	
Tamworth	32	18	50	
Thornton	51	19	70	
Unity	9	12	21	
Warren	47	53	100	
Washington	20	52	72	
Waterville Valley	0	0	0	
Wentworth	140	69	209	
Westmoreland	104	123	227	
Windsor	0	0	0	

The wide differences in "scores" and "points" shown in this exhibit do not represent the degrees of difference between the achievement levels of students in the various school districts. The real differences are small. Even if these tables displayed test scores they could not be used to compare school districts without detailed analysis of SES and other community factors. These tables do not contain test scores, they merely display rank orders. The rankings are used in this study to assist in selecting a representative sample of districts and to compare the answers to questions in different categories of districts. Comparisons based on this exhibit should not be used for other purposes.

EXHIBIT 3 - II

Statistical Summary of School District Groupings and Rankings of Sample School Districts

GROUPS	COUNTY	POPULATION	POPULATION RANGE OF GROUP	PERCENT OF POPULATION IN GROUP	NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN GROUP	GROUP AVERAGE SES SCORE
I			60136-96657	20.1%	2	59.7
Manchester	Hillsborough	96,657				
II			20145-29670	15.2%	5	59.6
Dover	Strafford	22,458				
Concord	Merrimack	29,670				
Salem	Rockingham	25,255				
III			9660-18551	20.4%	13	64.
Berlin	Coos	15,144				
Laconia	Belknap	14,947				
Merrimack	Hillsborough	11,827				
IV			4385-9580	20.8%	25	58.5
Mascona Valley Regional	Grafton	5,049				
Sanborn Regional	Rockingham	5,567				
Bedford	Hillsborough	6,859				
V			1270-4194	16.2%	50	64.4
Gorham	Coos	3,038				
Mascenic Regional	Hillsborough	4,049				
Bow	Merrimack	2,778				
VI			61-1508	7.3%	67	83.1
Unity	Sullivan	729				
Stoddard	Cheshire	276				
Brentwood	Rockingham	1,508				

GROUPS	DISTRICT SES SCORE	GROUP AVERAGE ACHIEVEMENT RANK	DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENT RANK	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS IN EACH DISTRICT	
				PROFESSIONAL	FAMILY
I		192.5			
Manchester	69.3		177	15	35
II		208.			
Dover	71.3		176	3	9
Concord	57.7		259	5	9
Salem	36.7		165	3	9
III		167.7			
Berlin	99.7		75	5	13
Laconia	69.7		167	5	13
Merrimack	35.7		180	5	13
IV		142.6			
Mascoma Valley Regional	100.9		58	5	13
Sanborn Regional	60.3		171	6	13
Bedford	44.2		237	5	13
V		139.			
Gorham	126.5		75	4	9
Mascenic Regional	65.7		125	4	10
Bow	31.8		267	4	9
VI		117.			
Unity	115.8		21	1	4
Stoddard	86.8		17	3	5
Brentwood	46.9		198	1	4

EXHIBIT 4 - II

PURPOSE AND USE OF SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to find out more about the needs of New Hampshire school children with special problems. Secondarily, it is also to find out more about the ways in which New Hampshire school districts respond to these needs.

In order for the survey to do any good your answers to the questions we would like to ask you should be as frank and as complete as possible.

The answers that you make to these questions will be added to those made by other persons in representative school districts throughout the state. In this way, a better understanding can be developed of the relationship between the achievement level of children with special problems, and conditions in the community, the family and the school.

When all the answers have been put together they will be made available to the public and to state and school officials who are attempting to develop school programs that respond to real needs.

Your name and address will not be made available to these persons or agencies nor will we use your name and address for any other purpose.

EXHIBIT 5 - II

Family Characteristics of Parent Sample By Type of School District

9c. Number of children at home?

	SES*			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
0-3	30.6	46.3	41.9	48.6	37.4	43.4	44.8	28.6	42.9
4 or More	69.4	53.7	58.1	51.4	62.6	56.6	55.2	71.4	57.1
Total	49	95	43	35	99	53	96	35	56

9d. Number of school-age children?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
0-3	46.9	59.4	55.8	62.9	52.0	56.6	58.3	48.6	54.4
4 or More	53.1	40.6	44.2	37.1	48.0	43.4	41.7	51.4	45.6
Total	49	96	43	35	100	53	96	35	57

9e. Number of children involved in "special" education programs?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
None	32.7	47.4	55.8	37.1	41.4	58.5	42.1	25.7	63.2
Some	67.3	52.6	44.2	62.9	58.6	41.5	57.9	74.3	36.8
Total	49	95	43	35	99	53	95	35	57

9f. How many parents live at home?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
One	16.3	45.8	22.7	22.9	41.0	24.1	43.3	14.3	26.3
Two	83.7	54.2	77.3	77.1	59.0	75.9	56.7	85.7	73.7
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

*SES means social and economic statistics

9g1. Mother's years of education?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
8 or Under	34.7	29.5	11.4	37.1	32.3	9.3	30.2	40.0	12.3
9-11	30.6	30.5	43.2	31.4	31.3	38.9	37.5	25.7	31.6
12 and Over	34.7	40.0	45.5	31.4	36.4	51.9	32.3	34.3	56.1
Total	49	95	44	35	99	54	96	35	57

9g2. Father's years of education?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
8 or Under	30.4	34.4	31.4	35.7	32.0	31.0	31.7	28.1	36.0
9-11	32.6	39.1	35.2	35.7	36.0	33.3	34.9	34.4	36.0
12 and Over	37.0	26.6	32.4	28.6	32.0	35.7	33.3	37.5	28.0
Total	46	64	35	28	75	42	63	32	50

9h1. Mother's occupation?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Employed	30.6	40.6	31.8	34.3	37.0	35.2	38.1	28.6	36.8
Not Employed	69.4	57.3	68.2	65.7	61.0	64.8	59.8	71.4	63.2
No Answer	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

9h2. Father's occupation?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Employed	89.8	61.5	72.7	80.0	70.0	68.5	59.8	91.4	78.9
Not Employed	6.1	5.2	6.8	2.9	5.0	9.3	5.2	2.9	8.8
No Answer	4.1	33.3	20.5	17.1	25.0	22.2	35.1	5.7	12.3
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

9i. Yearly income range?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Under $5500	19.1	51.7	39.0	24.2	49.5	33.3	54.5	14.7	32.1
$5500 and Over	80.9	48.3	61.0	75.8	50.5	66.7	45.5	85.3	67.9
Total	47	87	41	33	91	51	88	34	53

SECTION III

EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

This section contains an analysis of the results both of the research and of the survey described in Section II. The overall purpose of the study was to develop, on the basis of both research and an empirical survey of the opinion of parents and school and non-school professionals, a new and more accurate perception of educational disadvantage at this time in the State of New Hampshire.

Since passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act initiated the Title I Program of grants intended to assist educationally disadvantaged children, the Title I staff had grown increasingly concerned that the central assumption underlying the distribution of these funds was an over-simplification, perhaps, to the point of inaccuracy. The assumption in question, was that the principal indication of educational disadvantage was poverty in the family. The determination to look more deeply into the nature of educational disadvantage was not based on a judgment that poverty was irrelevant to educational disadvantage. But experience in administering the program gave repeated indications that a more detailed, complete and sensitively accurate description was necessary in order to enable local educators, school boards and parents to design Title I programs which would actually answer the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. Such a description, it was felt, would also enable Title I staff to discern the relative merits of alternative proposals on a more knowledgeable basis and to assist school districts in developing appropriate proposals.

The Nature of Disadvantage

Our approach to the task of describing educational disadvantage has been twofold. First, we have inquired into the general nature of disadvantage in the school districts of New Hampshire without specific references to interrelation with the educational system. Second, we have inquired into educational disadvantage specifically.

We were aided in the first part of our task by reference to a study prepared for the Rockingham County Community Action Agency in 1972. The purpose of this earlier study was to determine both the causes of poverty and what could be done to break the cycle of poverty. A sample was chosen carefully to reflect the urban, suburban and rural communities in Rockingham County, which to a considerable extent are typical of our State.

The representatives of 199 low income families interviewed represented a very real cross section of low income families in Rockingham County. Of the interviewees, 71 percent lived in families with gross annual incomes of less than $4,000 and 98 percent had incomes of $5,500 or below. This compares with the sample interviewed in the current study which contained representatives of 189 families, 21 percent of whom lived in families of gross annual incomes of over $4,000, 40 percent of $5,500 and below, and 77 percent of $7,000 and below. Considering the dramatic inflation which occurred between the Spring of 1972 and the Summer of 1974, when this survey was made, the groups are generally comparable in levels of economic well being.

The Rockingham County group, in response to a broadly constructed interview, made its views very clear:

- To them, the principal element of disadvantage was insufficient employment and employment services.
- The second most important element was the need for decent low cost housing.
- The third priority area was the lack of programs involving family counseling, budgeting and planning. The greatest concern in this area was to learn how to get the most out of every dollar in an insufficient income.
- Another priority was the need for communication about the availability of public assistance, general assistance and also non-money payment programs to help low income families.

The Rockingham County survey further indicated striking differences between people living in different sizes and types of communities in both the degree of awareness and the level of consensus as to the elements of disadvantage. The Rockingham results suggested that a group of indicators - compiled by school districts and including the principal elements of disadvantage identified by the Rockingham County group - could demonstrate both the presence of the elements of general economic disadvantage in New Hampshire school districts and compare the level of economic well being between the school districts.

The indicators described in Section II of the report were chosen a) for the purpose of using this comparison as a part of the mechanism for selecting a representative sample of districts, and b) for the purpose of forming a necessary part of the description of the incidence of the disadvantage of the school districts of our State. Exhibit 1 of this section is a district-by-district listing of seven of these indicators. The years of education completed by adults is not included in this exhibit for reasons referred to previously. The areas described by these statistical series are unemployment, housing, insufficient family income and comparative occurrence of relevant public and general assistance. These areas were identified as critical in the overall phenomenon of disadvantage by the Rockingham County group. The relationship of these general elements of disadvantage to educational disadvantage will be discussed later, in Section IV. At this point, it is enough to state that there is a relationship and that it is important to the fuller understanding of educational disadvantage.

The Nature of Educational Disadvantage

It was largely to find out what makes up educational disadvantage that the field survey of this study was conducted. Section II described the process of selecting a sample of approximately 10 percent of the state's school districts and commented upon the identification of individual interviewees residing or employed in the school systems or communities within these districts. We also discussed the preparation of the survey instruments used in interviewing the two basic groups in the sample. The first of these groups included 189 members of families which were identified as having one or more children with special problems which either prevented or made more difficult the achievement of satisfactory performance in school. No attempt has been made to ascertain exactly why in each instance the students' performance was considered unsatisfactory, either by teachers and other school officials or by the family. Rather, the questions were aimed at giving both groups the opportunity to express their views as fully as possible both as to the causes and the observable symptoms of educational disadvantage.

The Parents' View

Exhibit 2 is a compilation of the results of several of the questions from the parents' sample. Two of these questions are particularly relevant. Question 1 was aimed at enabling the parents to discuss and enumerate the causes of poor performance in school, and Question 2b asked them to specify which of these causes applied in their own families. These answers were identified by percentages of the parent sample, the causes and symptoms of educational disadvantage cited - and are listed below in the order of priority.

The third column below combines the percentages and indicates the overall order of importance which each of these aspects of educational disadvantage assumes in the view of the entire parent sample.

Parents' View

Question 1	Percentage
Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes	36.5
Family disruption	20.6
Permissiveness - home and school	19.6
Unsatisfactory teacher ability	19.6
Learning disabilities	16.4
Low student motivation	14.3
Unsatisfactory parental attitudes	12.2
Student dislike of school	11.6
Physical handicaps	11.1
Emotional - phychiatric problems	11.1
No preschool education	10.1
Question 2b	
Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes	28.4
Learning disabilities	18.9
Physical handicaps	15.4
Family disruption	14.2
Low student motivation	13.6
Permissiveness - home or school	12.4
Unsatisfactory teacher ability	10.7
Emotional - psychiatric problems	9.5
Student dislike of school	8.9
No preschool education	6.5

Combined	Percentage
Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes	32.5
Learning disabilities	17.7
Family disruption	17.4
Permissiveness - home and school	16.0
Unsatisfactory teacher ability	15.2
Low student motivation	14.0
Physical handicaps	13.3
Emotional - psychiatric problems	10.3
Student dislike of school	10.3

There are nine elements listed which were cited by more than 10 percent of the sample as being important in determining educational disadvantage.

The answers to other questions helped to fill out the picture further. In answering Question 4b, half of the 27 percent stating their children need types of assistance which are not available, indicate their belief that special classes in subject areas such as reading and arithmetic are the answer. More than 60 percent of those responding to Question 8a favored a very strong emphasis on basic education in such areas as reading and writing, and indicated a preference for courses that would provide the student with a "trade to get a job" and other employment related skills. In answering Question 16, the parents indicated that graduating from elementary and secondary schools was extremely important, but again put a strong emphasis on the need to learn a trade or employment skill. To do this, they indicated that completing studies were somewhat more important than achieving good grades and that it was also important to learn "to get along with others".

The Professionals' View

Exhibit 3 contains the answers to a series of questions in the interview instrument used for the school and non-school professionals' sample. Below, we have listed the answers to the questions most frequently selected by this sample in the order of preference.

The last column in the exhibit is the order of preference by average percentages obtained by combining the answers to Questions 2 and 3.

Representative View

Question 1	%
Learning disabilities	38.9
Emotional - psychiatric problems	36.1
Physical handicaps	29.2
Unsatisfactory economic background	26.4
Family disruption	25.0
Improper child care	20.8
Cultural deprivation	18.1
Low student motivation	18.1
Immaturity	16.7

Question 2	%
Family disruption	40.3
Unsatisfactory economic background	37.5
Improper child care	37.5
Physical handicaps	29.2
Experiential deprivation	25.0
Cultural deprivation	19.4
Permissiveness - home and school	13.9
Emotional - psychiatric problems	12.5

Question 1	%
Negative social behavior	16.7
Hyperactivity	12.5
Experiential deprivation	12.5

Question 2	%
Learning disabilities	12.5

Question 2c	%
Emotional - psychiatric problems	56.3
Low achievement	26.8
Negative social behavior	26.8
Learning disabilities	22.5
Physical handicaps	18.3
Low student motivation	15.5
Poor peer relations	11.3
Hyperactivity	11.3
Immaturity	8.5

Question 3	%
Poor economic background	30.6
Improper child care	26.4
Physical handicaps	25.0
Experiential deprivation	23.6
Family problems	20.8
Learning disabilities	16.7
Emotional psychiatric	15.3
Negative self-image	11.1
Cultural deprivation	9.7
Immaturity	6.9
Home environment	6.9
Teacher/administrator attitudes	6.9

Questions 2 and 3	%
Poor economic background	34
Improper child care	32
Family disruption	31
Physical handicaps	27
Experiential deprivation	24
Learning disabilities	15
Cultural deprivation	15
Emotional psychiatric	14
Negative self-image	10
Immaturity	8

The twelve causes and symptoms of educational disadvantage identified by the responses of Question 1, and the nine fundamental sources of disadvantage identified by the combined answers to Questions 2 and 3 add a further dimension to the description of educational disadvantage.

The answers to Question 13d indicate that there are several "blocks" to the effective participation by parents in dealing with problems of their children. These "blocks" are also a key part of the whole picture of educational disadvantage.

Contrasting Views

Exhibit 4 contains the answers to a selection of the questions which were asked on both questionnaires. Below we have listed in order of preference the conditions selected by the two groups separately in answer to Questions 13b and 14b which deal with environmental situations.

While there is fairly strong agreement that some of these conditions make it more difficult for students to do their best in school, it is evident there is wide disagreement on the importance of others. The third list below shows the combined preferences of the two groups.

Contrasting Views

Questions 13b and 14b

Parents	%	Professionals	%
Drugs and alcohol	69.9	Not enough good food	65.7
No pre-school education	52.4	No pre-school education	55.1
Not enough good food	49.2	Parents-limited education	52.1
Lack of medical care	37.2	One parent in home	50.0
Shortage of clothes	34.8	Drugs and alcohol	49.3
Inadequate housing	32.8	Low family income	47.1
Low family income	28.0	Lack of medical care	42.6
Unemployment	27.9	Unemployment	40.6
One parent in home	26.8	Family mobility	40.4
Parents-limited education	24.2	Shortage of clothes	26.1

Combined	%
Drugs and alcohol	60.0
Not enough good food	57.5
No pre-school education	53.5
Lack of medical care	40.0
One parent in home	38.5
Parents-limited education	38.0
Low family income	37.5
Unemployment	34.5
Shortage of clothes	30.0
Family mobility	20.0

It is noteworthy that the professional sample responded much more strongly. Of the ten priority items selected by the professional group, an average of 46.8 percent judged them important. The average percentage of parents participating in the selection of the ten most important conditions was only 38.1 percent.

Next, we list below the preference responses to Questions 15b and 16b asking the two groups how limiting various physical and emotional handicaps are to school performance.

Contrasting Views

Questions 15b and 16b

Parents	%	Professionals	%
Poor vision	64.6	Learning Disability	58.3
Poor hearing	63.5	Emotional nervousness	52.8
Inability to understand	63.0	Retardation	51.4

Parents	%	Professionals	%
Retardation	56.6	Poor vision	40.3
Learning Disability	55.0	Poor hearing	38.9
Mental illness	54.0	Mental illness	38.9
Emotional nervousness	51.9	Physical defects	22.2
Physical handicaps	44.4	Physical handicaps	18.1

Combined	%
Learning Disability	56.5
Retardation	54.0
Poor vision	52.5
Emotional nervousness	52.5
Poor hearing	51.5
Mental illness	46.5
Physical handicaps	31.5
Inability to understand	31.5

Once again, there is both agreement and disagreement. In contrast to the previous questions, however, the parents responded much more strongly to these questions, so an average of 57 percent of the parents identified the eight most frequently cited limiting conditions. Of the professionals indicating a preference, an average of only 41.5 percent agreed on the importance of the conditions.

The responses to questions listing a series of specific conditions, even though they do not represent the freely stated views of the interviewees in the same way as do the earlier questions discussed above, nevertheless serve to deepen and round out the perception of disadvantage. The professionals view environmental conditions as having a more frequently negative affect on school performance. Parents believe individual physical and emotional conditions are more important.

The divergence in views between the professional and parent group is further illustrated by the answers to Questions 17a and 17b. Of the professionals, 81 percent believe that the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems is positive. Only 45 percent of the parents agree. 44 percent of the professionals believe that in general, the attitudes of the child with educational problems toward the schools is positive. Only 15 percent of the parents agree.

The most important elements of educational disadvantage in the cumulative view of all 261 persons interviewed in the course of this survey are listed below. Also listed are the most important environmental conditions and physical or emotional conditions which in the view of the entire sample are detrimental to satisfactory school performance.

Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes
Learning disabilities
Family disruption

Permissiveness - home and school
Unsatisfactory teacher ability
Low student motivation
Physical handicaps
Emotional - psychiatric problems
Student dislike of school
Learning disabilities
Emotional - psychiatric problems
Physical handicaps
Unsatisfactory economic background
Family disruption
Improper child care
Cultural deprivation
Low student motivation
Immaturity
Negative social behavior
Hyperactivity
Experiential deprivation
Unsatisfactory economic background
Improper child care
Family disruption
Physical handicaps
Experiential deprivation
Cultural deprivation
Learning disabilities
Emotional - psychiatric problems
Negative self-image
Immaturity
Drugs and alcohol
Not enough good food
No pre-school education
Lack of medical care
One parent in home
Parents with limited education
Low family income
Unemployment
Shortage of clothes
Family mobility
Learning disabilities
Retardation
Poor vision
Emotional nervousness
Poor hearing
Mental illness
Physical handicaps
Inability to understand

These combined lists include all of the elements given priority identification by either of the groups. Similarly, they contain all of the environmental, physical or emotional conditions limiting school performance.

We have not attempted to "winnow out" the elements upon which there was not agreement between the two groups. To do so would negate the special value which the perception of each adds to our overall description.

One additional thought requires discussion at this point in description of educational disadvantage. It is clear from the answers to Questions 1 and 2 by the parents that unsatisfactory teacher attitudes and abilities are a strong source of parental concern. It is equally clear from their strong identification of family disruption and improper child care in answer to Questions 2 and 3, and lack of interest on the part of parents as a block to parental involvement in answer to Question 13d, that the professionals are deeply concerned about conditions in the home. It is not unnatural that these strongly conflicting concerns should exist between the professionals and members of families with children having school problems. The failure of satisfactory performance in school itself creates a great deal of this concern.

Question 19 appeared on both forms. It asked whether the schools had a special responsibility toward a child with problems. Approximately 94 percent of both groups answered in the affirmative.

The contrast between the nearly unanimous agreement on the responsibility of the schools for the problem child with the opposing views of parents and professionals as to where the cause for the problems lie, should be a matter of deep concern. These strongly opposed views may themselves constitute an element of disadvantage. The victims of these dissenting views, left unattended, will almost certainly be the very children whom all are concerned to help.

The full description of educational disadvantage, then, consists of:

- living in school districts which, compared to other districts, have relatively high unemployment, inadequate housing, insufficient family income and a high level of reliance on public and general assistance, and

- being members of school and family groups, or being individuals, with an incidence of environmental, health, teaching, learning, attitudinal and emotional deficiencies which make satisfactory school performance unlikely.

EXHIBIT 1 - III

Social and Economic Statistics By School District

School Districts	Percentage of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner	Orshansky Percentage
Albany	7.6	$ 2,696	25.0
Allenstown	3.3	4,690	4.9
Alton	4.5	3,860	.4
Amherst	4.4	5,631	8.3
Andover	3.3	4,369	5.9
Ashland	4.5	7,302	11.1
Auburn	4.4	7,119	5.5
Barnstead	3.3	5,492	17.8
Barrington	5.6	5,269	7.9
Bartlett	7.6	4,719	9.9
Bath	8.2		0.0
Bedford	4.4	4,644	2.0
Benton	8.2		47.4
Berlin	7.6	7,161	8.7
Bethlehem	8.2	4,163	0.0
Bow	3.3	9,563	0.0
Brentwood	3.9	6,520	6.3
Brookline	4.4	5,142	6.2
Campton	4.5	5,968	5.6
Candia	4.4	5,662	7.0
Chatham	7.6		0.0
Chester	4.4	5,629	4.7
Chesterfield	4.4	5,856	3.9
Chichester	3.3	3,985	12.1
Claremont	4.5	6,331	6.7
Clarksville	7.6		9.4
Colebrook	7.6	5,080	36.1
Columbia	7.6		3.2
Concord	3.3	6,626	8.4
Contoocook Valley	4.1	6,540	4.2
Conway	7.6	4,995	9.1
Cornish	4.5	4,624	7.9
Croydon	4.5	3,618	0.0
Deerfield	3.3	6,627	8.9
Derry	4.4	5,870	9.5

School Districts	Percentage of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner	Orshansky Percentage
Dover	5.6	$ 6,470	8.0
Dummer	7.6		0.0
Dunbarton	3.3	3,922	12.1
East Kingston	3.9	6,123	10.6
Eaton	7.6	4,504	0.0
Epping	3.9	4,990	10.0
Epsom	3.3	6,738	2.1
Errol	7.6	6,896	0.0
Exeter	3.9	6,880	1.1
Fall Mountain Regional	4.4	6,618	6.1
Farmington	5.6	6,612	12.9
Franklin	3.3	5,829	9.3
Freedom	4.5	2,536	15.0
Fremont	3.9	4,501	1.1
Gilford	4.5	5,770	1.3
Gilmanton	4.5	4,703	17.6
Goffstown	4.4	5,770	3.3
Gorham	7.6	4,229	9.3
Goshen-Lempster Coop.	4.5	3,599	16.4
Governor Wentworth Regional	4.7	4,774	10.9
Grantham	4.5	8,590	25.2
Greenland	3.9	9,942	10.0
Hampstead	3.9	4,987	0.0
Hampton	3.9	6,758	6.9
Hampton Falls	3.9	6,285	9.6
Hanover	4.5	7,852	1.2
Harrisville	4.4	9,109	0.0
Haverhill Coop.	8.2	4,847	10.9
Henniker	3.3	6,319	14.4
Hill	3.3	4,434	0.0
Hillsboro-Deering	3.3	5,855	3.4
Hinsdale	4.4	5,244	11.6
Holderness	4.5	3,891	2.0
Hollis	4.4	4,477	15.7
Hooksett	4.4	8,241	10.3

School Districts	Percentage of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner	Orshansky Percentage
Hopkinton	3.3	$ 8,929	0.6
Hudson	4.4	5,634	5.2
Inter-lakes Coop.	4.5	5,771	11.3
Jackson	7.6	5,425	22.7
Jaffrey-Rindge Coop.	4.4	5,663	9.3
Kearsarge Regional	4.1	5,405	1.9
Keene	4.4	7,043	5.9
Kensington	3.9	8,193	3.1
Laconia	4.5	6,326	4.9
Lafayette Regional	8.2	4,757	33.3
Landaff	8.2	3,486	16.2
Lebanon	4.5	6,345	6.8
Lincoln-Woodstock Coop.	8.2	6,425	11.1
Lisbon Regional	8.2	4,669	21.4
Litchfield	4.4	3,100	0.0
Littleton	8.2	5,718	4.9
Londonderry	4.4	7,381	9.6
Lyme	4.5	4,966	2.0
Lyndeborough	4.4	5,520	0.0
Madison	7.6	6,471	15.1
Manchester	4.4	6,767	8.2
Marlboro	4.4	4,320	3.9
Marlow	4.4	5,061	0.0
Mascenic Regional	4.4	7,125	7.5
Mascoma Valley Regional	4.5	4,153	8.3
Merrimack	4.4	7,999	4.1
Merrimack Valley	3.3	6,616	10.5
Middleton	5.6		13.7
Milan	7.6	5,336	5.7
Milford	4.4	6,579	9.6
Milton	5.6	5,936	2.3
Monadnock Regional	4.4	6,066	11.6
Monroe	8.2	12,113	0.0
Mont Vernon	4.4	5,237	0.0
Nashua	4.4	7,798	5.6

School Districts	Percentage of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner	Orshansky Percentage
Nelson	4.4	$ 2,067	0.0
New Boston	4.4	12,121	8.1
New Castle	3.9	4,823	1.1
Newfields	5.6	6,237	3.3
Newfound Area	4.5	6,576	13.0
Newington	3.9	8,486	2.1
Newmarket	5.6	5,786	8.6
Newport	4.5	6,115	14.3
North Hampton	3.9	5,726	6.0
Northumberland	7.6	7,355	7.3
Northwood	3.3	4,380	0.0
Nottingham	5.6	4,857	8.8
Orford	8.2	8,825	2.7
Oyster River Coop.	5.6	5,095	3.5
Pelham	4.4	5,083	7.3
Pembroke	3.3	6,392	8.2
Piermont	8.2	3,626	27.5
Pittsburg	7.6	4,537	15.5
Pittsfield	3.3	6,100	9.2
Plainfield	4.5	6,323	3.9
Plymouth	4.5	5,150	12.1
Portsmouth	3.9	6,188	1.2
Randolph	7.6	2,557	0.0
Raymond	4.4	4,676	8.0
Rochester	5.6	5,326	9.0
Rollinsford	5.6	5,133	5.9
Rumney	4.5	4,529	9.3
Rye	3.9	4,560	9.2
Salem	4.4	6,593	2.6
Sanborn Regional	3.9	5,448	5.5
Seabrook	3.9	6,997	12.2
Shaker Regional	4.2	5,673	5.0
Shelburne	7.6	2,361	7.1
Somersworth	5.6	6,365	8.8
South Hampton	3.9	10,934	16.2

School Districts	Percentage of Work Force Unemployed	Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner	Orshansky Percentage
Stark	7.6	$	26.4
Stewartstown	7.6	5,219	26.1
Stoddard	4.4	4,347	0.0
Strafford	5.6	4,050	0.0
Stratford	7.6	7,107	34.1
Stratham	3.9	7,562	12.3
Sunapee	4.5	4,784	13.2
Tamworth	7.6	4,423	15.5
Thornton	8.2	4,474	28.0
Timberlane Regional	3.9	5,832	6.4
Unity	4.5		0.0
Wakefield	5.6	5,073	14.4
Warren	4.5	3,872	0.0
Washington	4.5	6,474	25.0
Waterville Valley	8.2	7,730	25.5
Weare	4.4	5,699	0.0
Wentworth	4.5	5,902	0.0
Westmoreland	4.4	5,276	9.0
White Mountain Regional	8.2	5,227	9.5
Wilton	4.4	6,461	12.1
Winchester	4.4	6,939	3.5
Windham	4.4	7,215	5.8
Windsor	3.3	6,264	0.0
Winnisquam Regional	4.5	6,553	9.9

School Districts	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income
Albany	$ .77	47.8%	27.9%	$ 6,090
Allenstown	21.50	9.0	1.9	9,621
Alton	6.71	18.1	15.9	7,707
Amherst	1.52	8.2	4.5	13,247
Andover	12.98	6.5	10.9	10,513
Ashland	32.03	13.4	3.7	8,844
Auburn	11.76	8.8	6.5	9,514
Barnstead	15.05	15.7	9.2	9,303
Barrington	6.24	11.0	7.6	9,821
Bartlett	17.86	14.0	3.6	8,291
Bath	4.89	23.4	8.3	6,434
Bedford	2.62	5.1	1.7	12,559
Benton	0	22.0	26.6	5,722
Berlin	29.77	17.3	2.6	8,179
Bethlehem	9.93	6.6	2.0	10,651
Bow	1.74	3.1	3.5	12,105
Brentwood	.20	6.4	6.6	9,267
Brookline	13.29	10.4	4.8	9,781
Campton	14.30	11.1	5.7	9,318
Candia	3.35	5.6	7.0	9,520
Chatham	0	31.7	12.5	6,250
Chester	21.99	15.5	5.9	9,611
Chesterfield	10.88	6.8	4.8	9,526
Chichester	3.71	12.1	9.7	8,775
Claremont	22.31	12.9	2.2	8,778
Clarksville	0	32.3	10.9	7,833
Colebrook	35.67	16.3	7.2	8,057
Columbia	0	5.6	19.6	7,958
Concord	29.17	10.1	2.1	10,092
Contoocook Valley	14.02	10.1	6.3	9,975
Conway	20.08	11.8	3.2	8,272
Cornish	2.66	9.9	10.5	8,714
Croydon	0	14.6	22.9	7,409
Deerfield	6.37	13.2	11.6	10,196
Derry	27.26	11.8	2.8	10,542

School Districts	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income
Dover	$28.37	9.2%	1.9%	$ 9,824
Dummer	4.25	24.1	42.5	6,583
Dunbarton	4.49	11.4	5.6	9,500
East Kingston	13.15	5.9	3.2	10,388
Eaton	.98	56.5	15.4	8,600
Epping	33.46	7.4	6.6	8,718
Epsom	26.50	8.4	10.0	9,273
Errol	46.65	28.6	22.7	9,269
Exeter	22.58	10.7	2.6	9,460
Fall Mountain Regional	11.62	12.7	7.2	8,683
Farmington	28.05	11.9	6.1	8,844
Franklin	38.38	13.2	4.9	9,276
Freedom	17.75	18.8	13.3	6,483
Fremont	35.71	13.9	9.2	9,315
Gilford	1.59	9.5	1.3	11,590
Gilmanton	8.24	27.0	16.9	8,782
Goffstown	7.39	9.5	1.6	10,479
Gorham	36.54	13.5	24.5	8,511
Goshen-Lempster Coop	8.86	20.1	12.5	7,362
Governor Wentworth Regional	15.22	17.3	10.2	8,715
Grantham	13.62	20.2	11.4	8,125
Greenland	11.32	5.3	1.5	10,952
Hampstead	11.70	7.8	3.1	9,775
Hampton	13.29	10.0	1.4	10,582
Hampton Falls	4.88	5.7	2.1	10,711
Hanover	.80	8.6	3.0	13,953
Harrisville	13.65	17.6	16.2	7,657
Haverhill Coop.	33.80	13.7	6.2	8,150
Henniker	7.41	16.4	15.7	8,291
Hill	28.20	16.8	10.0	9,214
Hillsboro-Deering	17.45	11.5	7.6	8,737
Hinsdale	26.30	10.5	3.5	9,317
Holderness	.17	12.1	4.8	7,863
Hollis	1.44	19.1	2.9	10,549
Hooksett	6.75	10.4	2.8	10,456

School Districts	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income
Hopkinton	$ .70	6.4%	5.3%	$12,880
Hudson	12.52	5.0	1.1	11,406
Inter-lakes Coop.	20.26	11.5	7.7	9,263
Jackson	4.27	17.8	3.8	9,416
Jaffrey-Rindge Coop.	12.29	11.3	3.9	9,772
Kearsarge Regional	12.12	14.4	11.1	8,127
Keene	27.98	10.4	2.1	10,049
Kensington	1.93	16.7	5.1	9,735
Laconia	32.31	11.4	2.2	9,839
Lafayette Regional	14.63	37.3	7.5	8,800
Landaff	9.14	12.1	21.5	10,800
Lebanon	18.97	12.2	1.9	9,125
Lincoln-Woodstock Coop.	27.67	9.9	4.3	8,237
Lisbon Regional	11.53	23.7	13.2	11,043
Litchfield	5.59	5.0	1.2	11,151
Littleton	32.99	15.8	3.4	8,032
Londonderry	12.99	6.0	2.8	10,183
Lyme	9.77	7.1	11.6	9,111
Lyndeborough	6.80	9.0	14.3	12,778
Madison	3.28	20.0	6.7	8,916
Manchester	33.62	11.7	2.5	9,488
Marlboro	27.00	7.0	7.5	9,142
Marlow	9.81	13.7	26.6	7,543
Mascenic Regional	19.96	10.0	6.7	9,965
Mascoma Valley Regional	31.51	13.2	15.7	8,580
Merrimack	9.94	4.3	1.3	11,852
Merrimack Valley	2.61	11.3	7.5	9,009
Middleton	.66	21.8	23.6	7,833
Milan	18.65	5.5	16.1	8,166
Milford	17.33	9.9	1.9	9,947
Milton	10.61	15.9	19.9	8,364
Monadnock Regional	19.04	13.0	8.4	8,887
Monroe	6.57	15.5	6.4	10,052
Mont Vernon	18.09	7.0	4.5	11,035
Nashua	22.84	8.4	1.7	10,866

School Districts	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income
Nelson	$32.31	16.3%	21.0%	$ 7,208
New Boston	13.74	9.3	8.9	10,916
New Castle	0	11.5	1.2	13,860
Newfields	14.94	6.2	3.5	10,694
Newfound Area	18.64	16.1	13.6	8,604
Newington	28.11	10.1	3.8	10,486
Newmarket	29.71	13.0	3.1	8,714
Newport	18.40	10.6	6.5	8,963
North Hampton	7.47	10.6	0.9	10,860
Northumberland	20.15	12.5	5.8	8,350
Northwood	20.95	14.5	7.4	8,690
Nottingham	8.69	16.3	12.8	8,105
Orford	5.80	9.4	13.3	8,710
Oyster River Coop.	6.74	12.3	2.7	11,767
Pelham	9.71	8.4	1.3	11,010
Pembroke	18.09	8.9	2.5	9,825
Piermont	2.26	13.0	11.1	8,125
Pittsburg	14.67	10.2	20.5	7,625
Pittsfield	30.60	9.7	7.5	8,706
Plainfield	12.85	7.4	4.4	9,321
Plymouth	32.72	15.3	4.0	8,755
Portsmouth	55.05	12.5	2.0	8,704
Randolph	12.58	24.0	3.2	8,318
Raymond	36.63	15.4	5.7	8,600
Rochester	29.51	12.6	3.0	8,759
Rollinsford	15.38	9.9	2.2	10,102
Rumney	9.81	16.0	10.1	8,666
Rye	8.78	12.8	1.0	10,818
Salem	13.74	5.9	1.2	11,402
Sanborn Regional	4.00	11.9	4.3	9,008
Seabrook	41.70	9.5	6.1	9,438
Shaker Regional	8.83	9.3	6.8	9,154
Shelburne	0	30.9	13.7	9,083
Somersworth	24.46	11.8	1.5	9,933
South Hampton	0	16.8	3.0	10,535

School Districts	Public Aid Per Capita	Families With Income Under $4,000	Housing Lacking Basic Facilities	Median Family Income
Stark	$18.82	7.4%	9.7%	$ 6,333
Stewartstown	16.33	18.4	11.0	8,088
Stoddard	8.18	8.6	16.3	9,818
Strafford	6.85	19.1	10.3	9,656
Stratford	61.10	21.7	30.0	7,136
Stratham	13.62	17.4	2.2	9,716
Sunapee	3.41	17.5	5.6	8,175
Tamworth	4.17	21.7	10.2	5,478
Thornton	0	22.6	19.8	7,468
Timberlane Regional	15.34	8.1	3.1	11,180
Unity	.22	31.4	18.1	7,764
Wakefield	43.96	17.8	9.5	7,480
Warren	27.06	14.8	19.7	7,375
Washington	10.64	8.5	38.0	10,550
Waterville Valley	0	9.4		16,111
Weare	14.82	2.3	12.3	10,135
Wentworth	16.52		24.0	9,452
Westmoreland	11.55	14.6	7.5	9,875
White Mountain Regional	23.13	15.1	5.8	7,901
Wilton	24.57	15.6	3.2	8,346
Winchester	39.86	6.6	8.7	8,860
Windham	12.59	2.7	2.9	12,325
Windsor	0		6.7	11,000
Winnisquam Regional	31.35	14.1	6.0	8,404

EXHIBIT 2 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Parents' View

1. What kinds of things do you believe cause some children not to do their best in school?*

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Negative peer influence	7	3.7	182	96.3
Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/ school)	37	19.6	152	80.4
Parental attitudes	23	12.2	166	87.8
Teacher attitudes	69	36.5	120	63.5
Relations with peers	10	5.3	179	94.7
Parental behavior problems	5	2.6	184	97.4
Home environment (specific factors not identified)	12	6.3	177	93.7
Improper care in home	13	6.9	176	93.1
Family disruption or problems	39	20.6	150	79.4
Immaturity	10	5.3	179	94.7
Lack of preschool education	19	10.1	170	89.9
Poor study habits	2	1.1	187	98.9
Emotional or psychiatric problems	21	11.1	168	88.9
Hyperactivity	6	3.2	183	96.8
Negative social behavior	4	2.1	185	97.9
Truancy	3	1.6	186	98.4
Speech problems	8	4.2	181	95.8
Physically handicapping conditions	21	11.1	168	88.9
Inappropriate ability-grouping	8	4.2	181	95.8
Low interest in or motivation for school work	27	14.3	162	85.7
Crowded or noisy schools and classes	18	9.5	171	90.5
Learning or reading disabilities	31	16.4	158	83.6
Student dislike of teacher/school	22	11.6	167	88.4
Home/school teacher value conflict	2	1.1	187	98.9
Poor parent/school teacher communication/ cooperation	3	1.6	186	98.4
Teacher ability or classroom performance	37	19.6	152	80.4
Curriculum too accelerated	5	2.6	184	97.4

*In this and succeeding exhibits, miscellaneous, don't know, no answer and not codeable replies are excluded for purposes of brevity.

2b. Which ones (apply)?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Overly permissive; lack of discipline	21	12.4	148	87.6
Parental attitudes	4	2.4	165	97.6
Teacher attitudes	48	28.4	121	71.6
Relations with peers	3	1.8	166	98.2
Parental behavior problems	4	2.4	165	97.6
Home environment	8	4.7	161	95.3
Improper care in home	10	5.9	159	94.1
Family disruption or problems	24	14.2	145	85.8
Immaturity	8	4.7	161	95.3
Lack of preschool education	11	6.5	158	93.5
Poor study habits	0	0.0	169	100.0
Emotional or psychiatric problems	16	9.5	153	90.5
Hyperactivity	9	5.3	160	94.7
Negative social behavior	10	5.9	159	94.1
Truancy	4	2.4	165	97.6
Speech problems	13	7.7	156	92.3
Physical handicaps	26	15.4	143	84.6
Inappropriate ability-grouping	4	2.4	165	97.6
Low interest or motivation	23	13.6	146	86.4
Crowded or noisy classes	6	3.6	163	96.4
Learning or reading disabilities	32	18.9	137	81.1
Student dislike of teacher/school	15	8.9	154	91.1
Home/school teacher value conflict	1	0.6	168	99.4
Poor parent/school teacher communication/cooperation	3	1.8	166	98.2
Teacher ability or classroom performance	18	10.7	151	89.3
Curriculum too accelerated	2	1.2	167	98.8

4a. Have any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools?

50	26.9	136	73.1

4b. If yes (Question #4a), what kind of help (was not available)?

	Percentage
Communication - (1)	2.1
Tutoring - (6)	12.5
Teachers' aides - (1)	2.1
Preschool education - (1)	2.1
Special classes - (24)	50.0
Individualized instruction - (4)	8.3
Guidance/psychological help - (5)	10.4
Vocational/technical classes - (1)	2.1

8a. What do you think schools should provide for your children as far as their futures are concerned?

	Percentage
Preparation for life - (18)	11.5
More discipline/responsibility - (8)	5.1
Basic education - (61)	38.9
Education in social relations - (5)	3.2
Practical/life-relevant courses - (37)	23.6
Special education for handicapped/or retarded - (3)	1.9
Better/earlier diagnosis of problems - (2)	1.3
Intellectual stimulation - (2)	1.3
Better teacher-student relations - (1)	0.6
Individual attention - (3)	1.9
Career and psychological counseling - (8)	5.1

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

Graduation from elementary school

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not Very Important	Percentage
167	88.4	14	7.4	2	1.1

Graduation from high school

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
173	91.5	13	6.9	2	1.1

Learning a trade or work skill

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
166	87.8	19	10.1	3	1.6

Achieving good grades

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
121	64.0	58	30.7	7	3.7

Involvement in non-study school activities

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
81	42.9	81	42.9	20	10.6

Working part time to help the family

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
39	20.6	72	38.1	72	38.1

Completing study assignments

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
146	77.2	38	20.1	2	1.1

Learning to get along with others

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
147	77.8	42	22.2	0	0.0

Taking part in class discussions

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
111	58.7	63	33.3	12	6.3

Preparing for college

Very Important	Percentage	Fairly Important	Percentage	Not very Important	Percentage
69	36.5	65	34.4	50	26.4

EXHIBIT 3 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Professionals' View

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Economic background	19	26.4	53	73.6
Teacher ability	1	1.4	71	98.6
Teacher/administrator attitudes	2	2.8	70	97.2
Lack of special programs	2	2.8	70	97.2
Permissiveness in home/school	1	1.4	71	98.6
Negative parental attitudes toward school	2	2.8	70	97.2
Inappropriate ability grouping	1	1.4	71	98.6
Experiential deprivation	9	12.5	63	87.5
Cultural deprivation	13	18.1	59	81.9
Family problems/disruption	18	25.0	54	75.0
Home environment	4	5.6	68	94.4
Improper child care	15	20.8	57	79.2
Physical handicaps	21	29.2	51	70.8
Learning disabilities	28	38.9	44	61.1
Emotional/psychological problems	26	36.1	46	63.9
Poor/negative self-image	7	9.7	65	90.3
Low interest or motivation	13	18.1	59	81.9
Speech problems	7	9.7	65	90.3
Low achievement	2	2.8	70	97.2
Negative peer influence	0	0.0	72	100.0
Poor peer relations	4	5.6	68	94.4
Hyperactivity	9	12.5	63	87.5
Immaturity	12	16.7	60	83.3
Home/school value conflict	1	1.4	71	98.6
Physical appearance	5	6.9	67	93.1
Lack of preschool education	3	4.2	69	95.8
Working parents	3	4.2	69	95.8
Negative social behavior	12	16.7	60	83.3
Truancy	0	0.0	72	100.0
Legal problems	1	1.4	71	98.6

2a and
2b.
Why do some of these problems (Question #1) occur in your view? Are there common home or educational experiences which seem to cause these problems?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Economic background	27	37.5	45	62.5
Teacher ability	4	5.6	68	94.4
Teacher/administrator attitudes	6	8.3	66	91.7
Lack of special programs	6	8.3	66	91.7
Permissiveness in home/school	10	13.9	62	86.1
Negative parental attitudes toward school	7	9.7	65	90.3
Inappropriate ability grouping	1	1.4	71	98.6
Experiential deprivation	18	25.0	54	75.0
Cultural deprivation	14	19.4	58	80.6
Family problems/disruption	29	40.3	43	59.7

2c. What are some of the common signals that you feel identify students who need special help?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Economic background	2	2.8	69	97.2
Teacher ability	0	0.0	71	100.0
Teacher/administrator attitudes	1	1.4	70	98.6
Lack of special programs	0	0.0	71	100.0
Permissiveness in home/school	0	0.0	71	100.0
Negative parental attitudes toward school	0	0.0	71	100.0
Inappropriate ability grouping	0	0.0	71	100.0
Experiential deprivation	2	2.8	69	97.2
Cultural deprivation	1	1.4	70	98.6
Family problems/disruption	1	1.4	70	98.6
Home environment	1	1.4	70	98.6
Improper child care	5	7.0	66	93.0
Physical handicaps	13	18.3	58	81.7
Learning disabilities	16	22.5	55	77.5
Emotional/psychological problems	40	56.3	31	43.7
Poor/negative self-image	1	1.4	70	98.6
Low interest or motivation	11	15.5	60	84.5
Speech problems	4	5.6	67	94.4
Low achievement	19	26.8	52	73.2
Negative peer influence	0	0.0	71	100.0
Poor peer relations	8	11.3	63	88.7
Hyperactivity	8	11.3	63	88.7
Immaturity	6	8.5	65	91.5
Home/school value conflict	0	0.0	71	100.0
Physical appearance	3	4.2	68	95.8
Lack of preschool education	1	1.4	70	98.6
Working parents	0	0.0	71	100.0

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Negative social behavior	19	26.8	52	73.2
Truancy	2	2.8	69	97.2
Legal problems	1	1.4	70	98.6

3. Could you list in order of importance the areas of disadvantagement which lead to educational problems?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Economic background	22	30.6	50	69.4
Teacher ability	0	0.0	72	100.0
Teacher/administrator attitudes	5	6.9	67	93.1
Lack of special programs	0	0.0	72	100.0
Permissiveness in home/school	1	1.4	71	98.6
Negative parental attitudes toward school	4	5.6	68	94.4
Inappropriate ability grouping	1	1.4	71	98.6
Experiential deprivation	17	23.6	55	76.4
Cultural deprivation	7	9.7	65	90.3
Family problems/disruption	15	20.8	57	79.2
Home environment	5	6.9	67	93.1
Improper child care	19	26.4	53	73.6
Physical handicaps	18	25.0	54	75.0
Learning disabilities	12	16.7	60	83.3
Emotional/psychological problems	11	15.3	61	84.7
Poor/negative self-image	8	11.1	64	88.9
Low interest or motivation	4	5.6	68	94.4
Speech problems	3	4.2	69	95.8
Low achievement	3	4.2	69	95.8
Negative peer influence	1	1.4	71	98.6
Poor peer relations	4	5.6	68	94.4
Hyperactivity	2	2.8	70	97.2
Immaturity	5	6.9	67	93.1
Home/school value conflict	3	4.2	69	95.8
Physical appearance	1	1.4	71	98.6
Lack of preschool education	2	2.8	70	97.2
Working parents	2	2.8	70	97.2
Negative social behavior	3	4.2	69	95.8
Truancy	0	0.0	72	100.0
Legal problems	0	0.0	72	100.0

13d. Within the disadvantaged parents group, what do you see as blocks to effective involvement with the problems of their children?

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Working parent/lack of time	11	15.3	61	84.7
Parental emotional/psychological problems	4	5.6	68	94.4
Parental self-image	14	19.4	58	80.6
Communication problems	9	12.5	63	87.5

	Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
Lack of education/knowledge	9	12.5	63	87.5
Negative attitude toward schools	12	16.7	60	83.3
Defensiveness concerning children's problems	6	8.3	66	91.7
Lack of information concerning: Their rights; who to see; their children's problems	6	8.3	66	91.7

EXHIBIT 4 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Comparison of Parental and Professional Views

13b (Parent Form) and 14b (School Form).
Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (Rate the extent to which they disrupt good performance).

Percentages Across

Good Medical Care Not Available

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible	Total Responding
Professionals	42.6	41.2	16.2	68
Parents	37.2	38.8	24.0	183
Total				251
House Without Modern Plumbing, Electricity or Heat				
Professionals	19.7	54.5	25.8	66
Parents	32.8	35.5	31.7	183
Total				249
Shortage of Clothes				
Professionals	26.1	52.2	21.7	69
Parents	34.8	44.4	20.9	187
Total				251
Not Enough Good Food				
Professionals	65.7	30.0	4.3	70
Parents	49.2	39.2	11.6	181
Total				251
No Preschool Education				
Professionals	55.1	24.6	20.3	69
Parents	52.4	28.1	19.5	185
Total				254
Not Enough Family Income				
Professionals	47.1	42.6	10.3	68
Parents	28.0	45.5	26.5	189
Total				257
Use of Drugs or Alcohol				
Professionals	49.3	44.8	6.0	67
Parents	69.9	19.1	10.9	183
Total				250
Only One Parent in Home				
Professionals	50.0	41.4	8.6	70
Parents	26.8	45.8	27.4	179
Total				249

Percentages Across

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible	Total Responding
Unemployment				
Professionals	40.6	52.2	7.2	69
Parents	27.9	41.5	30.6	183
Total				252
Parents With Limited Education				
Professionals	52.1	39.4	8.5	71
Parents	24.2	33.3	42.5	186
Total				257
Parents' Health				
Professionals	25.4	67.2	7.5	67
Parents	21.6	48.1	30.3	185
Total				252
Family Mobility				
Professionals	40.4	47.1	12.9	70
Parents	9.7	25.8	64.5	186
Total				256

15b (Parent Form) and 16b (School Form).

Which of the following conditions most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

Percentages Across

	Most Limit	Less Limit	Total Responding
Overweight			
Professionals	11.1	88.9	72
Parents	16.4	83.6	189
Total			261
Contagious Diseases			
Professionals	12.5	87.5	72
Parents	27.0	73.0	189
Total			261
Mental Illness			
Professionals	38.9	61.1	72
Parents	54.0	46.0	189
Total			261
Learning Disabilities			
Professionals	58.3	41.7	72
Parents	55.0	45.0	189
Total			261
Retardation			
Professionals	51.4	48.6	72
Parents	56.6	43.4	189
Total			261
Crippling Physical Handicaps			
Professionals	18.1	81.9	72
Parents	44.4	55.6	189
Total			261

Percentages Across

	Most Limit	Less Limit	Total Responding
Poor Vision			
Professionals	40.3	59.7	72
Parents	64.6	35.4	189
Total			261
Poor Hearing			
Professionals	38.9	61.1	72
Parents	63.5	36.5	189
Total			261
Not Able to Understand What is Being Taught			
Professionals	0.0	100.0	72
Parents	63.0	37.0	189
Total			261
Physical Defects			
Professionals	22.2	77.8	72
Parents	34.9	65.1	189
Total			261
Underweight			
Professionals	15.3	84.7	72
Parents	16.9	83.1	189
Total			261
Emotional Nervousness			
Professionals	52.8	47.2	72
Parents	51.9	48.1	189
Total			261

17a (Parent Form) and 17a (School Form).

What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

Percentages Across

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total Responding
Professionals	80.9	8.8	10.3	68
Parents	45.1	38.6	16.3	184
Total				252

17b (Parent Form) and 17b (School Form).

What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

Percentages Across

	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Total Responding
Professionals	43.7	21.9	34.4	64
Parents	15.1	39.7	45.3	179
Total				243

SECTION IV

The Perception of Needs By Type of District

In Section II we described the process of selecting the sample of school districts within which the interviews which made up our field survey were to be conducted. This process included an analysis of population differences in districts which enabled a distinction to be made between urban, suburban and rural districts. It also included an analysis in order that the districts could be separated into those with favorable, average and unfavorable economic conditions. Lastly, it included a comparative analysis of the recorded level of achievement by students in each school district as measured by Stanford and Otis test scores so that the districts could be separated as to good, average and poor levels of achievement.

In Section III, we have analyzed the responses to questions designed to reveal the elements which, in the opinion of both of our sample groups, make up educational disadvantage in our state. The question to be answered in this part of Section IV is whether, if we look at the differing ways in which key questions are answered in the nine categories of districts alluded to above, we can begin to discern patterns in the occurrence of educational disadvantage.

The purpose here is to go beyond the description of educational disadvantage in order to identify the deficiencies the sample identified as likely to occur in each type of district. The final goal of this study is to enable both school districts and Title I planning personnel (a) to design programs which are accurately aimed at real educational disadvantages as identified by their parents and school personnel; and (b) to develop a sufficient level of awareness so that the programs they design will truly answer needs of their particular districts.

Needs Identified By the Interviewees

Exhibit 1 shows some of the key elements of educational disadvantage identified by both the parent and professional groups. It is apparent that in the opinion of both groups there are broad differences in the degree of occurrence of these indicators in different kinds of districts. These elements are further identified below in order of priority in each of the nine district breakdowns.

Elements of Educational Disadvantage

Views of Parents by Type of District

SES

Yes - Good	Yes - Average	Yes - Poor
Teacher attitudes	Teacher attitudes	Teacher attitudes
Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)	Family disruption or problems	Low interest in or motivation for school work
Lack of preschool education	Teacher ability or classroom performance	Learning or reading disabilities
Family disruption or problems	Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)	Student dislike of teacher/school
Learning or reading disabilities	Parental attitudes	Family disruption or problems
	Emotional or psychiatric problems	Teacher ability or classroom performance

Achievement Score

Yes - Good	Yes - Average	Yes - Poor
Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)	Teacher attitudes	Teacher attitudes
Teacher attitudes	Family disruption or problems	Low interest in or motivation for school work
Teacher ability or classroom performance	Teacher ability or classroom performance	Student dislike of teacher/school
Lack of preschool education	Parental attitudes	Learning or reading disabilities
Family disruption or problems	Learning or reading disabilities	Family disruption or problems
Crowded or noisy schools and classes		

Type of District

Yes - Urban	Yes - Suburban	Yes - Rural
Teacher attitudes	Teacher attitudes	Teacher attitudes
Teacher ability or classroom performance	Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)	Family disruption or problems
Family disruption or problems	Lack of preschool education	Learning or reading disabilities
Low interest in or motivation for school work	Learning or reading disabilities	Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)
Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school)	Teacher ability or classroom performance	Student dislike of teacher/school
Parental attitudes		

Elements of Educational Disadvantage

Views of Professionals by Type of District

SES

Yes - Good

- Emotional/psychological problems
- Cultural deprivation
- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical
- Family problems/ disruption
- Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
- Negative social behaviors

Yes - Average

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Economic background
- Family problems/ disruption
- Improper child care

Yes - Poor

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Economic background
- Family problems/ disruption
- Improper child care
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Poor/negative self-image

Achievement Score

Yes - Good

- Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Family problems/ disruption
- Cultural deprivation
- Low interest in or motivation for school work
- Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical

Yes - Average

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Economic background
- Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
- Family problems/ disruption
- Improper child care

Yes - Poor

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Economic background
- Low interest in or motivation for school work
- Experiential deprivation
- Family problems/ disruption
- Improper child care

Type of District

Yes - Urban

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Physically handicapping conditions: Health problems, heredity, etc.
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Improper child care
- Economic background

Yes - Suburban

- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Family problems/ disruption
- Cultural deprivation
- Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
- Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical

Yes - Rural

- Economic background
- Emotional/psychological problems
- Cultural deprivation
- Family problems/ disruption
- Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
- Low interest in or motivation for school work

Environmental and Health Needs

Exhibit 2 shows the different patterns of answers to Questions 13b and 14b and 15b and 16b in which both groups of interviewees were asked to prioritize the importance of specific environmental and health deficiencies in terms of their effect in making it more difficult for children to maintain satisfactory performance in school. Below we list the priorities ascribed to these factors in each of the types of districts. In the case of Questions 13b and 14b, the total sample has been divided to obtain separate preference lists.

Environmental Sources of Disadvantage

Views of Parents by Type of District

SES

Very Responsible Good	Very Responsible Average	Very Responsible Poor
No preschool education	Use of durgs or alcohol	Use of drugs or alcohol
Use of drugs or alcohol	No preschool education	Not enough good food
Not enough good food	Not enough good food	No preschool education
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	Good medical care not available	Good medical care not available
Good medical care not available	Only one parent in the home	Shortage of clothes
	Shortage of clothes	Parents with limited education

Achievement Score

Very Responsible Good	Very Responsible Average	Very Responsible Poor
Use of drugs or alcohol	Use of drugs or alcohol	Use of drugs or alcohol
No preschool education	No preschool education	Not enough good food
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	Not enough good food	No preschool education
Not enough good food	Good medical care not available	Good medical care not available
Good medical care not available	Shortage of clothes	Shortage of clothes

Type of District

Very Responsible Urban	Very Responsible Suburban	Very Responsible Rural
Use of drugs or alcohol	Use of drugs or alcohol	Use of drugs or alcohol
No preschool education	No preschool education	Not enough good food
Not enough good food	House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	No preschool education
Only one parent in the home	Not enough good food	Good medical care not available
Shortage of clothes	Shortage of clothes	House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat
	Good medical care not available	

Environmental Sources of Disadvantage

Views of Professionals by Type of District

SES

Very Responsible Good	Very Responsible Average	Very Responsible Poor
Not enough good food	Not enough good food	Parents with limited education
Good medical care not available	No preschool education	Not enough good food
No preschool education	Only one parent in the home	No preschool education
Only one parent in the home	Use of drugs or alcohol	Inadequate family transportation
Unemployment	Not enough family income	Good medical care not available

Achievement Score

Very Responsible Good	Very Responsible Average	Very Responsible Poor
Not enough good food	Not enough good food	Parents with limited education
Only one parent in the home	No preschool education	Not enough good food
Good medical care not available	Use of drugs or alcohol	No preschool education
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	Only one parent in the home	Use of drugs or alcohol
Not enough family income	Parents with limited education	Inadequate family transportation
Unemployment	Unemployment	
Use of drugs or alcohol		

Type of District

Very Responsible Urban	Very Responsible Suburban	Very Responsible Rural
Not enough good food	Not enough good food	Not enough good food
Use of drugs or alcohol	Only one parent in the home	No preschool education
Only one parent in the home	Not enough family income	Parents with limited education
No preschool education	Good medical care not available	Good medical care not available
Parents with limited education	No preschool education	Inadequate family transportation
	Unemployment	Not enough family income

Sources of Educational Disadvantage Related to Health

Combined Views by Parents and Professionals by Type of District

SES

Most Limiting Good	Most Limiting Average	Most Limiting Poor
Retardation	Poor vision	Retardation
Poor vision	Poor hearing	Learning disabilities
Poor hearing	Learning disabilities	Poor vision
Learning disabilities	Emotional nervousness	Mental illness
Mental illness	Retardation	Poor hearing
	Not able to understand what is being taught	Emotional nervousness
		Not able to understand what is being taught

Achievement Score

Most Limiting Good	Most Limiting Average	Most Limiting Poor
Poor vision	Poor vision	Retardation
Poor hearing	Poor hearing	Learning disabilities
Learning disabilities	Learning disabilities	Poor vision
Retardation	Retardation	Poor hearing
Emotional nervousness	Emotional nervousness	Mental illness
Mental illness		Emotional nervousness
Not able to understand what is being taught		Not able to understand what is being taught

Type of District

Most Limiting Urban	Most Limiting Suburban	Most Limiting Rural
Learning disabilities	Retardation	Poor vision
Poor hearing	Poor vision	Poor hearing
Poor vision	Poor hearing	Learning disabilities
Emotional nervousness	Learning disabilities	Retardation
Retardation	Emotional nervousness	Mental illness
	Mental illness	Not able to understand what is being taught
		Emotional nervousness

Awareness of Programs

Exhibit 3 shows the answers to a number of questions which occurred on one or the other or both instruments which were designed to demonstrate the level of awareness of the availability of programs both inside and outside the school system which could be used to assist students who were unable to maintain a satisfactory level of performance. The following percentages are an average of responses in the nine types of districts and indicate different cumulative levels of awareness in each type of district. All of the questions were averaged except for Question 7 on the school form.

Cumulative Awareness by Type of District

SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
52.8	61.2	62.8	50.6	61.7	60.7	62.0	56.3	59.8

The Roles of School Personnel

Exhibit 4 shows how the roles of school personnel were perceived in each type of district by both the parent and professional interviewees.

Program Needs

Exhibit 5 shows the preferences of the sample for different ameliorative emphases in school programming by type of district.

Participation and Support

The questions in this section are those which were designed to measure relative degrees of participation and support by the parents of educationally disadvantaged children. The lists which follow show the differences in the thinking of the total sample in response to Questions 12a and 13a and 14 and 15 by type of district. (See Exhibit 6)

Participation and Involvement by Parents

Combined Views of Parents and Professionals by Type of District

SES

Yes - Good	Yes - Average	Yes - Poor
Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers
Parents' nights	Parents' nights	Parents' nights
Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals
Specifically requesting more information	Parent-Teacher organizations	Parent-Teacher organizations
Parent-Teacher organizations	Specifically requesting more information	Specifically requesting more information

Achievement Score

Yes - Good	Yes - Average	Yes - Poor
Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers
Parents' nights	Parents' nights	Parents' nights
Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals
Specifically requesting more information	Parent-Teacher organizations	Parent-Teacher organizations
Parent-Teacher organizations	Specifically requesting more information	Specifically requesting more information

Type of District

Yes - Urban	Yes - Suburban	Yes - Rural
Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers	Individual conferences with teachers
Parents' nights	Parents' nights	Parents' nights
Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals	Meetings with principals
Specifically requesting more information	Specifically requesting more information	Parent-Teacher organizations
Parent-Teacher organizations	Parent-Teacher organizations	Specifically requesting more information

Methods of Student Support Compared

Combined Views of Parents and Professionals by Type of District

SES

Most Helpful Good	Most Helpful Average	Most Helpful Poor
Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child
A happy home	Encouragement to do well by parents	A happy home
Encouragement to do well by parents	A happy home	Encouragement to do well by parents
Frequent good family discussions	Having reference books and other study aids available	Frequent good family discussions
Having reference books and other study aids available	Frequent good family discussions	Having reference books and other study aids available

Achievement Score

Most Helpful Good	Most Helpful Average	Most Helpful Poor
Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child
Encouragement to do well by parents	A happy home	A happy home
A happy home	Encouragement to do well by parents	Encouragement to do well by parents
Frequent good family discussions	Frequent good family discussions	Having reference books and other study aids available
Having reference books and other study aids available	Having reference books and other study aids available	Frequent good family discussions

Type of District

Most Helpful Urban	Most Helpful Suburban	Most Helpful Rural
Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child
A happy home	Frequent good family discussions	Encouragement to do well by parents
Encouragement to do well by parents	A happy home	A happy home
Having reference books and other study aids available	Encouragement to do well by parents	Having reference books and other study aids available
Frequent good family discussions	Having reference books and other study aids available	Frequent good family discussions

Attitudinal Questions

Exhibit 7 brings together questions which measure the attitudes of the respondents towards various prospective student achievements as well as other attitudinal questions. The lists which follow illustrate the differences in answers to Question 16 by type of district.

Comparative Importance of Student Achievements

Views of the Parents by Type of District

SES

Very Important Good	Very Important Average	Very Important Poor
Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school	Learning to get along with others
Graduation from high school	Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill	Learning a trade or work skill	Learning a trade or work skill.
Completing study assignments	Learning to get along with others	Completing study assignments
Learning to get along with others	Completing study assignments	Graduation from elementary school

Achievement Score

Very Important Good	Very Important Average	Very Important Poor
Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school	Learning to get along with others
Graduation from high school	Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school
Completing study assignments	Learning a trade or work skill	Learning a trade or work skill
Learning a trade or work skill	Learning to get along with others	Graduation from elementary school
Learning to get along with others	Completing study assignments	Completing study assignments

Type of District

Very Important Urban	Very Important Suburban	Very Important Rural
Graduation from high school	Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school
Graduation from elementary school	Graduation from high school	Learning a trade or work skill
Learning a trade or work skill	Learning a trade or work skill	Graduation from elementary school
Learning to get along with others	Completing study assignments	Learning to get along with others
Completing study assignments	Achieving good grades	Completing study assignments

Special Program Funding

Two questions with regard to the perception by professionals as to funding of special programs were asked. (See Exhibit 8)

Children in Special Education

Exhibit 9 contains the income distribution of families with children receiving special education by type of district. It is included in order to indicate the degree to which parents in the different types of economic, achievement and population districts differ as to the likelihood that their disadvantaged children will receive special education.

EXHIBIT 1 - IV

Educational Disadvantage By Type of School District
Parent Form

1. What kinds of things do you believe cause some children not to do their best in school?

(Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school))

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	32.7	18.7	6.8	42.9	13.0	16.7	13.4	40.0	17.5
No	67.3	81.2	93.2	57.1	87.0	83.3	86.6	60.0	82.5
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Parental attitudes)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	8.2	13.5	13.6	2.9	16.0	11.1	13.4	8.6	12.3
No	91.8	86.5	86.4	97.1	84.0	88.9	86.6	91.4	87.7
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Teacher attitudes)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	40.8	35.4	34.1	31.4	41.0	31.5	34.0	45.7	35.1
No	59.2	64.6	65.9	68.6	59.0	68.5	66.0	54.3	64.9
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Family disruption or problems)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	22.4	19.8	20.5	11.4	25.0	18.5	21.6	14.3	22.8
No	77.6	80.2	79.5	88.6	75.0	81.5	78.4	85.7	77.2
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Lack of preschool education)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	28.6	5.2	0.0	22.9	11.0	0.0	7.2	31.4	1.8
No	71.4	94.8	100.0	77.1	89.0	100.0	92.8	68.6	98.2
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Emotional or psychiatric problems)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	6.1	13.5	11.4	8.6	12.0	11.1	12.4	8.6	10.5
No	93.9	86.5	88.6	91.4	88.0	88.9	87.6	91.4	89.5
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Physically handicapping conditions)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	8.2	9.4	18.2	2.9	12.0	14.8	11.3	8.6	12.3
No	91.8	90.6	81.8	97.1	88.0	85.2	88.7	91.4	87.7
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Low interest in or motivation for school work)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	6.1	12.5	27.3	5.7	13.0	22.2	19.6	8.6	8.8
No	93.9	87.5	72.7	94.3	87.0	77.8	80.4	91.4	91.2
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Crowded or noisy schools and classes)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	8.2	11.5	6.8	11.4	10.0	7.4	12.4	8.6	5.3
No	91.8	88.5	93.2	88.6	90.0	92.6	87.6	91.4	94.7
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Student dislike of teacher/school)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	8.2	8.3	22.7	2.9	9.0	22.2	10.3	8.6	15.8
No	91.8	91.7	77.3	97.1	91.0	77.8	89.7	91.4	84.2
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Learning or reading disabilities)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	20.4	10.4	25.0	8.6	16.0	22.2	10.3	28.6	19.3
No	79.6	89.6	75.0	91.4	84.0	77.8	89.7	71.4	80.7
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Teacher ability or classroom performance)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	18.4	19.8	20.5	25.7	19.0	16.7	23.7	17.1	14.0
No	81.6	80.2	79.5	74.3	81.0	83.3	76.3	82.9	86.0
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

School Form

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?

(Economic background)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	18.7	29.7	26.3	8.3	32.4	26.1	28.9	0.0	36.4
No	81.2	70.3	73.7	91.7	67.6	73.9	71.1	100.0	63.6
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Experiential deprivation)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	6.2	13.5	15.8	16.7	5.4	21.7	13.2	0.0	18.2
No	93.7	86.5	84.2	83.3	94.6	78.3	86.8	100.0	81.8
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Cultural deprivation)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	31.2	13.5	15.8	33.3	13.5	17.4	13.2	25.0	22.7
No	68.7	86.5	84.2	66.7	86.5	82.6	86.8	75.0	77.3
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Family problems/disruption)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	25.0	24.3	26.3	41.7	21.6	21.7	23.7	33.3	22.7
No	75.0	75.7	73.7	58.3	78.4	78.3	76.3	66.7	77.3
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Improper child care)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	6.2	24.3	26.3	16.7	21.6	21.7	34.2	0.0	9.1
No	93.7	75.7	73.7	83.3	78.4	78.3	65.8	100.0	90.9
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Physically handicapping conditions: Health problems, heredity, etc.)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	25.0	35.1	21.1	50.0	29.7	17.4	39.5	25.0	13.6
No	75.0	64.9	78.9	50.0	70.3	82.6	60.5	75.0	86.4
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Learning disabilities: mental, retardation, short attention, etc.)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	31.2	45.9	31.6	16.7	51.4	30.4	47.4	41.7	22.7
No	68.7	54.1	68.4	83.3	48.6	69.6	52.6	58.3	77.3
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Emotional/Psychological problems)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	50.0	35.1	26.3	50.0	40.5	21.7	36.8	41.7	31.8
No	50.0	64.9	73.7	50.0	59.5	78.3	63.2	58.3	68.2
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Poor/Negative self-image)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	6.2	8.1	15.8	8.3	5.4	17.4	5.3	8.3	18.2
No	93.7	91.9	84.2	91.7	94.6	82.6	94.7	91.7	81.8
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Low interest in or motivation for school work)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	12.5	16.2	26.3	25.0	10.8	26.1	18.4	8.3	22.7
No	87.5	83.8	73.7	73.0	89.2	73.9	81.6	91.7	77.3
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Speech or language problems)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	0.0	10.8	15.8	0.0	8.1	17.4	13.2	0.0	9.1
No	100.0	89.2	84.2	100.0	91.9	82.6	86.8	100.0	90.9
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Hyperactivity)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	0.0	18.9	10.5	8.3	13.5	13.0	18.4	0.0	9.1
No	100.0	81.1	89.5	91.7	86.5	87.0	81.6	100.0	90.9
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Immaturity: Emotional, mental and physical)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	31.2	13.5	10.5	25.0	18.9	8.7	21.1	25.0	4.5
No	68.7	86.5	89.5	75.0	81.1	91.3	78.9	75.0	95.5
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Negative social behavior)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	25.0	10.8	21.1	16.7	16.2	17.4	21.1	16.7	9.1
No	75.0	89.2	78.9	83.3	83.8	82.6	78.9	83.3	90.9
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

EXHIBIT 2 - IV

Environmental and Health Needs By Type of District
Parent and School Form

13b (Parent Form) and
14b (School Form). Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (Rate the extent to which they disrupt good performance.)

(Good medical care not available) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	40.0	41.2	47.4	36.4	44.1	43.5	40.5	36.4	50.0
Responsible	46.7	38.2	42.1	36.4	41.2	43.5	37.8	45.5	45.0
Not Responsible	13.3	20.6	10.5	27.3	14.7	13.0	21.6	18.2	5.0
Total	15	34	19	11	34	23	37	11	20

(Good medical care not available) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	50.0	29.0	40.5	41.2	35.1	38.5	31.9	58.8	32.7
Responsible	37.5	37.6	42.9	38.2	37.1	42.3	37.2	29.4	47.3
Not Responsible	12.5	33.3	16.7	20.6	27.8	19.2	30.9	11.8	20.0
Total	48	93	42	34	97	52	94	34	55

(House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	6.7	33.3	5.6	27.3	24.2	9.1	23.5	9.1	19.0
Responsible	60.0	42.4	72.2	45.5	51.5	63.6	55.9	45.5	57.1
Not Responsible	33.3	24.2	22.2	27.3	24.2	27.3	20.6	45.5	23.8
Total	15	33	18	11	33	22	34	11	21

(House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	52.1	26.9	23.8	47.1	30.6	27.5	25.3	62.9	26.4
Responsible	33.3	31.2	47.6	29.4	32.7	45.1	34.7	31.4	39.6
Not Responsible	14.6	41.9	28.6	23.5	36.7	27.5	40.0	5.7	34.0
Total	48	93	42	34	98	51	95	35	53

(Shortage of clothes) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	12.5	38.2	15.8	25.0	35.3	13.0	36.1	8.3	19.0
Responsible	50.0	47.1	63.2	50.0	47.1	60.9	47.2	50.0	61.9
Not Responsible	37.5	14.7	21.1	25.0	17.6	26.1	16.7	41.7	19.0
Total	16	34	19	12	34	23	36	12	21

(Shortage of clothes) (Parents)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	49.0	28.4	32.6	40.0	34.3	32.1	32.3	60.0	23.2
Responsible	30.6	48.4	51.2	40.0	41.4	58.8	44.8	28.6	53.6
Not Responsible	20.4	23.2	16.3	20.0	24.2	15.1	22.9	11.4	23.2
Total	49	95	43	35	99	53	96	35	56

(Not enough good food) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	56.2	68.6	68.4	50.0	71.4	65.2	70.3	50.0	66.7
Responsible	37.5	25.7	31.6	41.7	25.7	30.4	27.0	41.7	28.6
Not Responsible	6.2	5.7	0.0	8.3	2.9	4.3	2.7	8.3	4.8
Total	16	35	19	12	35	23	37	12	21

(Not enough good food) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	55.1	39.6	63.4	45.5	43.3	62.7	41.8	62.9	52.7
Responsible	40.8	41.8	31.7	42.4	41.2	33.3	38.5	34.3	43.6
Not Responsible	4.1	18.7	4.9	12.1	15.5	3.9	19.8	2.9	3.6
Total	49	91	41	33	97	51	91	35	55

(No preschool education) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	37.5	64.7	52.6	25.0	61.8	60.9	55.6	33.3	66.7
Responsible	37.5	14.7	31.6	33.3	20.6	26.1	19.4	33.3	28.6
Not Responsible	25.0	20.6	15.8	41.7	17.6	13.0	25.0	33.3	4.8
Total	16	34	19	12	34	23	36	12	21

(No preschool education) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	77.1	42.6	46.5	61.8	55.1	41.5	44.2	79.4	50.0
Responsible	18.7	29.8	34.9	23.5	23.5	39.6	28.4	17.6	33.9
Not Responsible	4.2	27.7	18.6	14.7	21.4	18.9	27.4	2.9	16.1
Total	48	94	43	34	98	53	95	34	56

(Not enough family income) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	31.2	55.9	44.4	27.3	57.1	40.9	47.1	41.7	50.0
Responsible	50.0	35.3	50.0	63.6	34.3	45.5	47.1	33.3	40.9
Not Responsible	18.7	8.8	5.6	9.1	8.6	13.6	5.9	25.0	9.1
Total	16	34	18	11	35	22	34	12	22

(Not enough family income) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	28.6	28.1	27.3	28.6	28.0	27.8	25.8	37.1	26.3
Responsible	46.9	42.7	50.0	42.9	46.0	46.3	44.3	51.4	43.9
Not Responsible	24.5	29.2	22.7	28.6	26.0	25.9	29.9	11.4	29.8
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Use of drugs or alcohol) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	33.3	58.8	44.4	27.3	55.9	50.0	60.0	27.3	42.9
Responsible	60.0	35.3	50.0	63.6	41.2	40.9	37.1	63.6	47.6
Not Responsible	6.7	5.9	5.6	9.1	2.9	9.1	2.9	9.1	9.5
Total	15	34	18	11	34	22	35	11	21

(Use of drugs or alcohol) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	75.0	64.9	75.6	73.5	64.3	78.4	60.0	82.9	79.2
Responsible	20.8	19.1	17.1	11.8	23.5	15.7	24.2	14.3	13.2
Not Responsible	4.2	16.0	7.3	14.7	12.2	5.9	15.8	2.9	7.5
Total	48	94	41	34	98	51	95	35	53

(Only one parent in the home) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	37.5	61.1	38.9	50.0	55.6	40.9	58.3	50.0	36.4
Responsible	56.2	30.6	50.0	50.0	36.1	45.5	33.3	41.7	54.5
Not Responsible	6.2	8.3	11.1	0.0	8.3	13.6	8.3	8.3	9.1
Total	16	36	18	12	36	22	36	12	22

(Only one parent in the home) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	28.6	28.4	21.4	23.5	33.0	17.6	35.6	25.7	13.0
Responsible	55.1	33.0	61.9	50.0	36.2	60.8	35.6	60.0	53.7
Not Responsible	16.3	38.6	16.7	26.5	30.9	21.6	28.9	14.3	33.3
Total	49	88	42	34	94	51	90	35	54

(Unemployment) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	37.5	44.1	36.8	27.3	48.6	34.8	45.7	33.3	36.4
Responsible	50.0	47.1	63.2	72.7	40.0	60.9	51.4	50.0	54.5
Not Responsible	12.5	8.8	0.0	0.0	11.4	4.3	2.9	16.7	9.1
Total	16	34	19	11	35	23	35	12	22

(Unemployment) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	34.7	23.4	30.0	29.4	28.3	26.0	28.4	37.1	20.8
Responsible	42.9	36.2	52.5	41.2	37.4	50.0	34.7	48.6	49.1
Not Responsible	22.4	40.4	17.5	29.4	34.3	24.0	36.8	14.3	30.2
Total	49	94	40	34	99	50	95	35	53

(Parents with limited education) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	31.2	50.0	73.7	16.7	52.8	69.6	54.1	25.0	63.6
Responsible	62.5	36.1	26.3	75.0	33.3	30.4	32.4	66.7	36.4
Not Responsible	6.2	13.9	0.0	8.3	13.9	0.0	13.5	8.3	0.0
Total	16	36	19	12	36	23	37	12	22

(Parents with limited education) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	16.3	24.5	32.6	20.0	23.5	28.3	27.4	17.1	23.2
Responsible	40.8	28.7	34.9	40.0	30.6	34.0	32.6	45.7	26.8
Not Responsible	42.9	46.8	32.6	40.0	45.9	37.7	40.0	37.1	50.0
Total	49	94	43	35	98	53	95	35	56

(Parents' health) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	0.0	36.4	26.3	9.1	30.3	26.1	31.4	0.0	28.6
Responsible	93.3	51.5	73.7	72.7	60.6	73.9	60.0	90.9	66.7
Not Responsible	6.7	12.1	0.0	18.2	9.1	0.0	8.6	9.1	4.8
Total	15	33	19	11	33	23	35	11	21

(Parents' health) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	14.3	28.0	16.3	17.1	26.5	15.4	31.6	14.3	9.1
Responsible	40.8	44.1	65.1	42.9	39.8	67.3	42.1	42.9	61.8
Not Responsible	44.9	28.0	18.6	40.0	33.7	17.3	26.3	42.9	29.1
Total	49	93	43	35	98	52	95	35	55

(Inadequate family transportation) (School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	18.7	42.9	52.6	25.0	40.0	47.8	38.9	16.7	54.5
Responsible	75.0	37.1	42.1	66.7	42.9	43.5	41.7	83.3	36.4
Not Responsible	6.2	20.0	5.3	8.3	17.1	8.7	19.4	0.0	9.1
Total	16	35	19	12	35	23	36	12	22

(Inadequate family transportation) (Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Responsible	12.5	8.4	9.3	11.8	10.1	7.5	10.4	8.8	8.9
Responsible	29.2	22.1	30.2	29.4	24.2	26.4	21.9	35.3	26.8
Not Responsible	58.3	69.5	60.5	58.8	65.7	66.0	67.7	55.9	64.3
Total	48	95	43	34	99	53	96	34	56

15b (Parent Form and
16b (School Form). Following is a list of conditions. Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

(Overweight)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	32.3	11.3	4.8	21.3	16.8	7.8	7.4	44.7	10.1
Less Limiting	67.7	88.7	95.2	78.7	83.2	92.2	92.6	55.3	89.9
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Contagious diseases)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	41.5	18.0	14.3	29.8	23.4	18.2	14.1	51.1	21.5
Less Limiting	58.5	82.0	85.7	70.2	76.6	81.8	85.9	48.9	78.5
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Mental illness)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	72.3	41.4	44.4	59.6	46.7	49.4	40.0	74.5	51.9
Less Limiting	27.7	58.6	55.6	40.4	53.3	50.6	60.0	24.5	48.1
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Learning disabilities)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	75.4	50.4	47.6	68.1	53.3	53.2	47.4	78.7	57.0
Less Limiting	24.6	49.6	52.4	31.9	46.7	46.8	52.6	2;/3	43.0
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Retardation)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	83.1	45.1	47.6	63.8	52.6	54.5	43.7	85.1	57.0
Less Limiting	16.9	54.9	52.4	36.2	47.4	45.5	56.3	14.9	43.0
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Crippling physical handicaps)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting.	61.5	28.6	30.2	40.4	37.2	35.1	25.9	61.7	41.8
Less Limiting	38.5	71.4	69.8	59.6	62.8	64.9	74.1	38.3	58.2
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Poor vision)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	81.5	51.1	47.6	70.2	56.2	53.2	45.9	83.0	63.3
Less Limiting	18.5	48.9	52.4	29.8	43.8	46.8	54.1	17.0	36.7
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Poor Hearing)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	80.0	51.1	44.4	70.2	55.5	50.6	46.7	83.0	58.2
Less Limiting	20.0	48.9	55.6	29.8	44.5	49.4	53.3	17.0	41.8
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Not able to understand what is being taught)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	64.6	42.1	33.3	57.4	44.5	40.3	35.6	68.1	49.4
Less Limiting	35.4	57.9	66.7	42.6	55.5	59.7	64.4	31.9	50.6
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Physical defects)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	43.1	32.3	17.5	34.0	34.3	24.7	23.0	57.4	30.4
Less Limiting	56.9	67.7	82.5	66.0	65.7	75.3	77.0	42.6	69.6
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Underweight)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	26.2	15.8	7.9	17.0	19.7	10.4	13.3	31.9	12.7
Less Limiting	73.8	84.2	92.1	83.0	80.3	89.6	86.7	68.1	87.3
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Emotional nervousness)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Limiting	66.2	49.6	42.9	63.8	49.6	49.4	45.2	76.6	49.4
Less Limiting	33.8	50.4	57.1	36.2	50.4	50.6	54.8	23.4	50.6
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

EXHIBIT 3 - IV

Comparative Awareness of Program Availability
Parent Form

3a. Are you aware of any kinds of help available in the schools to help with these kinds of problems?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	83.7	88.4	75.0	77.1	91.0	75.5	89.5	94.3	85.7
No	16.3	11.6	25.0	22.9	9.0	24.5	10.5	5.7	14.3
Total	49	95	44	35	100	53	95	35	56

3c. How did it work out?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Good	67.6	80.4	86.4	65.0	78.7	84.6	78.6	70.4	83.3
Neutral	2.9	3.9	9.1	0.0	4.9	7.7	5.4	3.7	4.2
Bad	29.4	15.7	4.5	35.0	16.4	7.7	16.1	25.9	12.5
Total	34	51	22	20	61	26	56	27	24

4a. Have any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	28.6	23.4	32.6	22.9	25.5	32.1	24.5	28.6	29.8
No	71.4	76.6	67.4	77.1	74.5	67.9	75.5	71.4	70.2
Total	49	94	43	35	98	53	94	35	57

6b. Do you know of specific programs you could turn to for this help?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	23.3	46.7	48.8	29.4	42.7	47.1	48.8	28.1	37.5
No	74.4	53.3	48.8	67.6	57.3	51.0	51.2	68.7	60.7
Total	43	90	41	34	89	51	86	32	56

7a. Do you know of (other) people or places outside the school system where you could go for help?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	59.2	76.0	67.4	60.0	75.0	66.0	77.1	57.1	64.9
No	38.8	22.9	30.2	37.1	25.0	30.2	22.9	40.0	31.6
Total	49	96	43	35	100	53	96	35	57

7c. Did they help the children?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	76.0	83.6	87.0	66.7	86.4	84.6	81.5	73.7	90.0
No	12.0	5.5	8.7	11.1	6.8	7.7	7.4	15.8	3.3
Don't Know	12.0	10.9	4.3	22.2	6.8	7.7	11.1	10.5	6.7
Total	25	55	23	18	59	26	54	19	30

School Form

10d. Have you referred children to any of them? (Persons in the community who are knowledgeable about or involved with the needs of educationally disadvantaged children)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	31.2	29.7	42.1	33.3	32.4	34.8	34.2	41.7	27.3
No	31.2	18.9	21.1	16.7	27.0	17.4	21.1	33.3	18.2
No Answer	37.5	51.4	36.8	50.0	40.5	47.8	44.7	25.0	54.5
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

7. What programs are you aware of or involved in that deal specifically with the educationally disadvantaged child? (Coded for number of programs cited.)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
0-3	31.2	51.4	57.9	16.7	56.8	52.2	52.6	33.3	50.0
4 or More	68.7	48.6	42.1	83.3	43.2	47.8	47.4	66.7	50.0
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

EXHIBIT 4 - IV

Roles of School Personnel by District
Parent Form

6a. Who is the first person or what is the first place you would go to seek help for a child having problems with studies or behavior related to school?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Teacher	32.7	49.4	45.2	41.2	40.9	50.0	51.8	17.1	48.1
Guidance Counselor	8.2	14.5	2.4	8.8	12.5	5.8	5.9	11.4	14.8
Principal/Assistant Principal	55.1	26.5	40.5	44.1	38.6	32.7	31.8	68.6	27.8
Other	4.1	9.6	11.9	5.9	8.0	11.5	10.6	2.9	9.3
Total	49	83	42	34	88	52	85	35	54

EXHIBIT 5 - IV
Preferences in School Programming
PARENT FORM

8a. What do you think schools should provide for your children as far as their futures are concerned?

	SES				Achievement Score				Type of District			
	Good	Average	Poor	Total	Good	Average	Poor	Total	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Total
Preparation for life	50.0	44.4	5.6	18	22.2	72.2	5.6	18	27.8	44.4	27.8	18
More discipline/ responsibility	37.5	50.0	12.5	8	37.5	37.5	25.0	8	37.5	37.5	25.0	8
Basic education	36.1	42.6	21.3	61	27.9	47.5	24.6	61	42.6	26.2	31.1	61
Education in social relations	0.0	80.0	20.0	5	0.0	60.0	40.0	5	60.0	0.0	40.0	5
Practical/life-relevant courses	21.6	43.2	35.1	37	18.9	43.2	37.8	37	59.5	13.5	27.0	37
Special education for handicapped or retarded	0.0	66.7	33.3	3	33.3	0.0	66.7	3	33.3	0.0	66.7	3
Better/earlier diagnosis of problems	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0	0.0	2
Intellectual stimulation	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	2
Better teacher-student relations	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	1
Individual attention	33.3	66.7	0.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	3
Career and psychological counseling	0.0	75.0	25.0	8	0.0	50.0	50.0	8	50.0	0.0	50.0	8
Miscellaneous	0.0	88.9	11.1	9	0.0	66.7	33.3	9	44.4	0.0	55.6	9

4b. If any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools, what kind of help (was not available)?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Special Classes	53.8	54.5	38.5	88.9	45.8	33.3	48.0	44.4	57.1
Other	46.2	45.5	61.5	11.1	54.2	66.7	52.0	55.6	42.9
Total	13	22	13	9	24	15	25	9	14

EXHIBIT 6 - IV

Parental Participation and Support
Parent Form

3b. Have you tried to use the kinds of help available of which you are aware?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	85.4	80.5	72.7	84.6	81.5	73.7	81.6	96.4	65.9
No	14.6	19.5	27.3	15.4	18.5	26.3	18.4	3.6	34.1
Total	41	82	33	26	92	38	87	28	41

7b. If you know of (other) people or places outside the schools where you could go for help, have you or someone you know used them?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	82.8	82.6	82.8	77.3	83.1	85.3	78.6	90.0	86.5
No	17.2	17.4	17.2	22.7	16.9	14.7	21.4	10.0	13.5
Total	29	69	29	22	71	34	70	20	37

9a. Have you attempted to voice your opinion or take some action to make the schools respond in a better way to the needs of your children?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	51.0	45.3	39.5	48.6	44.4	45.3	39.6	54.3	50.0
No	49.0	54.7	60.5	51.4	55.6	54.7	60.4	45.7	50.0
Total	49	95	43	35	99	53	96	35	56

9b. If yes (to Question #9a), did anyone listen?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes+*	14.3	20.8	15.9	20.0	15.0	22.2	18.6	5.7	24.6
Yes	18.4	13.5	13.6	0.0	21.0	13.0	11.3	22.9	15.8
No	18.3	22.9	15.9	25.8	22.0	13.0	22.6	20.0	15.8
No Answer	49.0	42.7	54.5	54.3	42.0	51.9	47.4	51.4	43.9
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

*Yes, plus a specific listener is identified

Parent and School Form

12a (Parent Form and
13A (School Form). Have you been involved in (do parents get involved in) any of the following?

(Parent-Teacher Organizations)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	35.9	49.6	42.6	36.2	44.7	49.3	43.2	34.8	52.6
No	64.1	50.4	57.4	63.8	55.3	50.7	56.8	65.2	47.4
Total	64	129	61	47	132	75	132	46	76

(Parents' Nights)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	78.5	65.1	72.1	76.6	67.9	70.3	68.7	78.7	67.6
No	21.5	34.9	27.9	23.4	32.1	29.7	31.3	21.3	32.4
Total	65	126	61	47	131	74	131	47	74

(Individual conferences with teachers)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	79.7	83.6	80.0	87.0	80.3	81.1	80.9	80.4	84.0
No	20.3	16.4	20.0	13.0	19.7	18.9	19.1	19.6	16.0
Total	64	128	60	46	132	74	131	46	75

(School board meetings)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	27.4	26.7	35.0	20.5	25.0	40.5	21.8	25.0	43.2
No	72.6	73.3	65.0	79.5	75.0	59.5	78.2	75.0	56.8
Total	62	120	60	44	124	74	124	44	74

(Attendance in classes)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	24.2	37.1	34.5	20.0	37.5	33.8	37.2	27.3	29.6
No	75.8	62.9	65.5	80.0	62.5	66.2	62.8	72.7	70.4
Total	62	124	58	45	128	71	129	44	71

(Meetings with principals)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	68.7	61.7	63.8	66.0	63.6	63.4	61.1	78.3	60.3
No	31.2	38.3	36.2	34.0	36.4	36.6	38.9	21.7	39.7
Total	64	128	58	47	132	71	131	46	73

(Organizing parent groups)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	25.4	27.1	26.8	20.0	26.6	30.9	24.6	28.9	28.6
No	74.6	72.9	73.2	80.0	73.4	69.1	75.4	71.1	71.4
Total	63	118	56	45	124	68	122	45	70

(Specifically requesting more information)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	41.9	43.0	37.7	47.7	39.4	41.5	44.0	38.6	38.8
No	58.1	57.0	62.3	52.3	60.6	58.5	56.0	61.4	61.2
Total	62	121	53	44	127	65	125	44	67

Parent and School Form

14 (Parent Form) and
15 (School Form). Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?

(A study schedule for completing homework)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	66.[illegible]	60.2	54.0	70.2	59.9	54.5	59.3	70.2	55.7
Less Helpful	33.8	39.8	46.0	29.8	40.1	45.5	40.7	29.8	44.3
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Help with homework by other family members)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	61.5	52.6	46.0	63.8	53.3	46.8	54.1	66.0	44.3
Less Helpful	38.5	47.4	54.0	36.2	46.7	53.2	45.9	34.0	55.7
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Encouragement to do well by parents)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	89.2	88.7	88.9	95.7	86.1	89.6	86.7	89.4	92.4
Less Helpful	10.8	11.3	11.1	4.3	13.9	10.4	13.3	10.6	7.6
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Having reference books and other study aids available)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	78.5	75.2	73.0	83.0	71.5	77.9	73.3	78.7	77.2
Less Helpful	21.5	24.8	27.0	17.0	28.5	22.1	26.7	21.3	22.8
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Frequent good family discussions)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	83.1	75.2	74.6	93.6	72.3	75.3	72.6	91.5	75.9
Less Helpful	16.9	24.8	25.4	6.4	27.7	24.7	27.4	8.5	24.1
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	98.5	91.0	95.2	100.0	90.5	96.1	91.1	97.9	96.2
Less Helpful	1.5	9.0	4.8	0.0	9.5	3.9	8.9	2.1	3.8
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	58.5	42.9	38.1	57.4	46.7	36.4	40.7	61.7	44.3
Less Helpful	41.5	57.1	61.9	42.6	53.3	63.6	59.3	38.3	55.7
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

(A happy home)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Most Helpful	93.8	88.0	95.2	95.7	86.9	96.1	90.4	91.5	92.4
Less Helpful	6.2	12.0	4.8	4.3	13.1	3.9	9.6	8.5	7.6
Total	65	133	63	47	137	77	135	47	79

EXHIBIT 7 - IV

Comparative Attitudes by District
Parent Form

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

(Graduation from elementary school)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	100.0	87.5	77.3	97.1	91.0	77.8	85.6	100.0	86.0
Fairly Important	0.0	8.3	13.6	2.9	6.0	13.0	8.2	0.0	10.5
Not Important	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.5
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Graduation from high school)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	100.0	89.6	86.4	97.1	93.0	85.2	88.7	100.0	91.2
Fairly Important	0.0	7.3	13.6	2.9	4.0	14.8	8.2	0.0	8.8
Not Important	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Learning a trade or work skill)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	98.0	84.4	84.1	94.3	88.0	83.3	83.5	97.1	89.5
Fairly Important	2.0	12.5	13.6	5.7	10.0	13.0	14.4	2.9	7.0
Not Important	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	0.0	1.8
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Achieving good grades)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	57.1	65.6	68.2	68.6	61.0	66.7	66.0	68.6	57.9
Fairly Important	40.8	26.0	29.5	28.6	31.0	31.5	28.9	31.4	33.3
Not Important	2.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	7.0
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Involvement in non-study school activities)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	44.9	41.7	43.2	48.6	41.0	42.6	43.3	51.4	36.8
Fairly Important	46.9	40.6	43.2	37.1	45.0	42.6	40.2	40.0	49.1
Not Important	6.1	13.5	9.1	8.6	12.0	9.3	13.4	5.7	8.8
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Working part time to help the family)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	14.3	24.0	20.5	17.1	24.0	16.7	27.8	8.6	15.8
Fairly Important	51.0	27.1	47.7	48.6	32.0	42.6	32.0	54.3	38.6
Not Important	32.7	45.8	27.3	28.6	42.0	37.0	37.1	34.3	42.1
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Completing study assignments)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	83.7	72.9	79.5	97.1	70.0	77.8	72.2	97.1	73.7
Fairly Important	16.3	22.9	18.2	2.9	27.0	18.5	24.7	2.9	22.8
Not Important	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.9	1.0	0.0	1.8
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Learning to get along with others)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	59.2	82.3	88.6	71.4	74.0	88.9	79.4	65.7	82.5
Fairly Important	40.8	17.7	11.4	18.6	26.0	11.1	20.6	34.3	17.5
Not Important	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Taking part in class discussions)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	53.1	60.4	61.4	68.6	53.0	63.0	54.6	62.9	63.2
Fairly Important	44.9	27.1	34.1	31.4	34.0	33.3	37.1	37.1	24.6
Not Important	2.0	10.4	2.3	0.0	11.0	1.9	6.2	0.0	10.5
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

(Preparing for college)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Very Important	20.4	42.7	40.9	25.7	37.0	42.6	40.2	28.6	35.1
Fairly Important	42.9	28.1	38.6	48.6	28.0	37.0	32.0	45.7	31.6
Not Important	36.7	26.0	15.9	22.9	33.0	16.7	23.7	25.7	31.6
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

18. Do you think the schools feel the families of children with problems are "different" in any way?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	59.2	49.0	34.1	48.6	58.0	29.6	52.6	57.1	35.1
No	38.8	43.7	59.1	51.4	35.0	63.0	39.2	42.9	59.6
Total	49	96	44	35	100	54	97	35	57

Parent and School Form

17a. What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Positive	46.2	54.0	65.6	54.3	48.9	65.3	54.7	48.9	58.4
Neutral	30.8	34.9	21.3	30.4	34.4	24.0	32.0	29.8	28.6
Negative	23.1	11.1	13.1	15.2	16.8	10.7	13.3	21.3	13.0
Total	65	126	61	46	131	75	128	47	77

17b. What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Positive	15.9	22.0	31.6	20.0	19.7	29.6	24.0	20.0	21.9
Neutral	41.3	29.3	40.4	33.3	36.2	33.8	34.4	40.0	32.9
Negative	42.9	48.8	28.1	46.7	44.1	36.6	41.6	40.0	45.2
Total	63	123	57	45	127	71	125	45	73

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a child with problems?

(School)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	87.5	94.6	100.0	91.7	91.9	100.0	94.7	83.3	100.0
No	12.5	5.4	0.0	8.3	8.1	0.0	5.3	16.7	0.0
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

(Parent)

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	95.8	91.5	95.3	94.1	91.8	96.2	91.6	94.1	96.4
No	4.2	8.5	4.7	5.9	8.2	3.8	8.4	5.9	3.6
Total	48	94	43	34	98	53	95	34	56

EXHIBIT 8 - IV

The Professionals' Knowledge of Special Programs
School Form

8a. How have special programs been developed or funded?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Know	81.2	83.8	94.7	75.0	83.8	95.7	98.5	75.0	86.4
Don't Know	18.7	10.8	5.3	16.7	13.5	4.3	7.9	25.0	9.1
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

8b. Have federal funds been useful in this area?

	SES			Achievement Score			Type of District		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Yes	50.0	81.1	94.7	58.3	73.0	95.7	81.6	50.0	86.4
No	18.7	2.7	0.0	8.3	8.1	0.0	2.6	16.7	4.5
Don't Know	25.0	2.7	5.3	25.0	5.4	4.3	2.6	33.3	4.5
Total	16	37	19	12	37	23	38	12	22

EXHIBIT 9 - IV

Parent Form

Income Distribution of Families With Children in Special Education by Type of District

	SES					
	Good		Average		Poor	
	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over
None*	44.4	28.9	55.6	39.0	50.0	62.5
Some*	55.6	71.1	44.4	61.0	50.0	37.5
Total	9	38	45	41	16	24

	Achievement Score					
	Good		Average		Poor	
	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over
None	62.5	28.0	51.1	31.1	52.9	63.6
Some	37.5	72.0	48.9	68.9	47.1	36.4
Total	8	25	45	45	17	33

	Type of District					
	Urban		Suburban		Rural	
	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over	Under $5500	$5500 and Over
None	54.2	26.3	40.0	24.1	52.9	69.4
Some	45.8	73.7	60.0	75.9	47.1	30.6
Total	48	38	5	29	17	36

*None means families which have no children in special education. Some means families which have one or more children in special education.

SECTION V

Areas for Further Study

In the course of analyzing the large body of data generated during this study, several provocative questions arose which appear to warrant further study and investigation.

Communications

Another anomaly presented itself in the area of communications between the schools and the parents. Asked whether a number of communications devices were of value, - whether or not they were currently in use - there was nearly unanimous agreement between the two groups that they were (Questions 11b and 12b).

However, when the professionals were asked whether these communications tools were being currently employed, their answers varied greatly with those of parents who were asked whether they are receiving them (Questions 11a and 12a). With the exception of report cards, which nearly all respondents agreed were in existence, answers varied from more than 20 percent to more than 40 percent regarding other communications tools, as shown in the table below.

Report Cards	
Professionals	92.9
Parents	92.0

Periodic Information About School Affairs	
Professionals	87.3
Parents	68.5

School Newsletters	
Professionals	51.7
Parents	28.8

Individual Reports From Teachers	
Professionals	90.6
Parents	69.9

Individual Reports From Counselors	
Professionals	72.3
Parents	29.3

Information on Available Special Help	
Professionals	68.9
Parents	36.3

Requests Teacher/Parent Conferences	
Professionals	97.1
Parents	71.7

It seems fair to conclude from these divergent figures, that no matter how accurate the views of the professionals on the current use of these communication methods, parents either do not receive them or do not recognize what they are.

This would lead to a conclusion that these tools for communicating between the schools and the parents of educationally disadvantaged students must be made more understandable and distributed in ways to bring them more forcefully to the attention of parents.

The Availability and Utilization of Special Education

Exhibit 9 in Section IV illustrates the participation of children in special education courses who are members of families which make up our sample by income range within each type of school district. It is apparent that there are other ways in which this question can be approached. One of the ways which appears useful is to find out whether there are differences in participation in special education by income group in different types of families. The following, Exhibit 1, is an opening approach to some of these questions. Over the whole sample, it makes several things apparent:

- there is a much larger participation in special education by children in families with incomes of more than $5,500 than there is in lower income families;
- there is a larger participation in special education when the family has two parents living at home than when it has only one;
- there is a higher rate of participation in special education if the mother has attended high school than if she has attended eight grades or less;
- conversely, there is a lower rate of participation if the mother has attended more than twelve grades. These last two observations may indicate a greater perception of need by the mother if she has attended high school and a smaller incidence of need if she has a higher education;
- the figures for participation when linked to the fathers' years of education follow closely the results with the mothers', except for a higher rate of participation when the father has a high school diploma or above;
- there is a significantly larger percentage of participation in special education in families with four or more children at home and four or more school-age children.

Attitudes Toward the Role of School Personnel

Exhibit 4 in Section IV shows differences in attitudes toward school personnel in different types of districts. Questions 10a and 11a asked which types of school personnel should be most helpful to youngsters having problems. Questions 10b and 11b asked for a judgment as to which types of personnel have, in fact, been helpful.

The answers to these questions as shown in Exhibit 2 are revealing. It is obvious that some types of school personnel are not thought to be very relevant to the problems of disadvantaged children. Even more striking, are the wide differences between the answers of the professionals and the parents.

Another insight as to how the roles of school personnel are seen, is contained in the different answers from school districts with different achievement levels. Exhibit 3 shows these differences. Administrators, other than superintendents and principals, are not seen as playing a very strong role in poor achievement districts. Similarly, guidance counselors are not thought to be highly relevant to the needs of youngsters in poor achievement areas. The same is true, although to a lesser extent, of special teachers and student teachers.

On the other hand, superintendents, school nurses and school board members are thought to be more relevant in low achievement areas. It may be that low achievement school districts do not have as many of the first types of personnel on their staffs as school districts with better achievement levels.

Participation and Support

Section IV also discusses the answers to Questions 12a and 13b concerning the involvement of parents and Questions 14 and 15 asking which forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement.

Exhibit 4 illustrates briefly both the areas of agreement and differences in opinion in response to these questions. In general, there is agreement between parents and professionals that the opportunities for participation listed in 12a and 13a are effective, but there is a strong disagreement between the two groups as to whether the parents actually have been involved in the specified activities. The parents and professionals are strongly disagreed as to the usefulness of the forms of support listed in Questions 14 and 15. Parents display much more faith than professionals in study skills, help with homework, encouragement by the parents, availability of reference books and other study aids, and in the power of example set by other members of the family who are achievers and in the influence of a happy home.

EXHIBIT 1 - V

Parent Form
Consideration of a Number of Variables in Relation to the Number of Children in Special Education

(Yearly income range)

	Under $5500	$5500 and Over
None*	52.9	40.8
Some*	47.1	59.2
Total	70	103

(How many parents live at home?)

	One	Two
None	53.2	41.6
Some	46.8	58.4
Total	62	125

(Mother's years of education)

	8 or Below	9-11	12 and Above
None	46.9	36.5	51.4
Some	53.1	63.5	48.6
Total	49	63	74

(Mother's years of education)

	High School	High School and Above
None	41.1	51.4
Some	58.9	48.6
Total	112	74

(Father's years of education)

	8 or Below	9-11	12 and Above
None	44.7	34.0	45.7
Some	55.3	66.0	54.3
Total	47	50	46

(Father's years of education)

	High School	High School and Above
None	39.2	45.7
Some	60.8	54.3
Total	97	46

(Number of children at home)

	0-3	4 or More
None	55.3	38.5
Some	44.7	61.5
Total	76	109

(Number of school age children)

	0-3	4 or More
None	53.4	35.7
Some	46.6	64.3
Total	103	84

*None means families which have no children in special education. Some means families which have one or more children in special education.

EXHIBIT 2 - V

Attitudes Toward the Role of School Personnel

	Should be Helpful	Are Helpful
Superintendents		
Professionals	58.3	82.9
Parents	42.3	60.4
Principals		
Professionals	91.7	96.8
Parents	82.0	86.8
Other Administrators		
Professionals	45.8	86.0
Parents	38.1	81.3
Classroom Teachers		
Professionals	87.5	100.0
Parents	90.5	92.7
Guidance Counselors		
Professionals	84.7	93.6
Parents	74.7	89.6
Reading or Other Special Teachers		
Professionals	83.3	98.3
Parents	72.5	95.0
School Nurses		
Professionals	87.5	98.4
Parents	59.3	90.8
School Board Members		
Professionals	44.4	65.7
Parents	24.3	56.3
Librarians		
Professionals	27.8	78.6
Parents	30.7	86.8
Aides		
Professionals	50.0	87.8
Parents	38.1	83.6
Student Teachers		
Professionals	30.6	81.5
Parents	30.7	82.6
Gym Teachers or Coaches		
Professionals	45.8	86.8
Parents	46.6	84.6

EXHIBIT 3 - V

Views as to Helpfulness of School Personnel
Parent and School Form

10a (Parent Form) and
11a (School Form).

Which of these types of people do you believe should be most helpful to youngsters who are having problems?

(Superintendent)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	46.8	44.5	50.6
No	53.2	55.5	49.4
Total	47	137	77

(Principal)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	89.4	83.9	83.1
No	10.6	16.1	16.9
Total	47	137	77

(Other administrators)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	44.7	43.1	32.5
No	55.3	56.9	67.5
Total	47	137	77

(Classroom teachers)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	95.7	88.3	88.3
No	4.3	11.7	11.7
Total	47	137	77

(Guidance counselors)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	85.1	82.5	66.2
No	14.9	17.5	33.8
Total	47	137	77

(Reading or other "special" teachers)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	83.0	76.6	68.8
No	17.0	23.4	31.2
Total	47	137	77

(School nurses)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	66.0	62.8	75.3
No	34.0	37.2	24.7
Total	47	137	77

(School board members)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	36.2	21.2	41.6
No	63.8	78.8	58.4
Total	47	137	77

(Librarians)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	31.9	27.0	33.8
No	68.1	73.0	66.2
Total	47	137	77

(Aides)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	51.1	33.6	49.4
No	48.9	66.4	50.6
Total	47	137	77

(Student teachers)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	40.4	32.8	20.8
No	59.6	67.2	79.2
Total	47	137	77

(Gym teachers or coaches)

	Achievement Score		
	Good	Average	Poor
Yes	51.1	46.0	44.2
No	48.9	54.0	55.8
Total	47	137	77

EXHIBIT 4 - V

Parental Involvement

12a (Parent Form) and 13a (School Form).

Have you been involved in (do parents get involved in) any of the following?

12b (Parent Form) and 13b (School Form).

How do you rate their effectiveness (the effectiveness of such involvement)?

	Percentages Across			Percentages Across		
	Yes	No	Total Responding	Effective	Not Effective	Total Responding
Parent-Teacher Organizations						
Professionals	70.6	29.4	68	68.5	31.5	54
Parents	34.9	65.1	186	76.6	23.4	124
Total			254			178
Parents' Nights						
Professionals	85.1	14.9	67	73.4	26.7	60
Parents	64.9	35.1	185	84.0	16.0	150
Total			252			210
Individual Conferences With Teachers						
Professionals	97.1	2.9	68	98.4	1.5	65
Parents	76.1	23.9	184	93.1	6.9	159
Total			252			224
School Board Meetings						
Professionals	54.0	46.0	63	79.1	20.9	43
Parents	20.1	79.9	179	84.5	15.5	97
Total			242			140
Attendance in Classes						
Professionals	31.2	68.7	64	72.2	27.8	36
Parents	33.9	66.1	180	88.0	11.9	109
Total			244			145
Meetings With Principals						
Professionals	85.3	14.7	68	98.2	1.8	55
Parents	56.0	44.0	182	89.4	10.6	132
Total			250			187
Organizing Parent Meetings						
Professionals	50.0	50.0	62	89.2	10.8	37
Parents	18.3	81.7	175	88.5	11.5	96
Total			237			133
Specifically Requesting More Information						
Professionals	63.3	36.7	60	88.1	11.9	42
Parents	34.1	65.9	176	84.9	15.1	106
Total			236			148

14 (Parent Form) and 15 (School Form).
Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?

	Percentages Across		
A Study Schedule For Completing Homework	Most Helpful	Less Helpful	Total Responding
Professionals	19.4	80.6	72
Parents	75.7	24.3	189
Total			261

	Most Helpful	Less Helpful	Total Responding
Help With Homework by Other Family Members			
Professionals	27.8	72.2	72
Parents	63.0	37.0	189
Total			261
Encouragement to Do Well by Parents			
Professionals	79.2	20.8	72
Parents	92.6	7.4	189
Total			261
Having Reference Books and Other Study Aids Available			
Professionals	47.2	52.8	72
Parents	86.2	13.8	189
Total			261
Frequent Good Family Discussions			
Professionals	72.2	27.8	72
Parents	78.8	21.2	189
Total			261
Relationships of Trust and Confidence Between Parent and Child			
Professionals	93.1	6.9	72
Parents	94.2	5.8	189
Total			261
Good Rates of Achievement in Work or School by Other Family Members			
Professionals	27.8	72.2	72
Parents	52.4	47.6	189
Total			261
A Happy Home			
Professionals	80.6	19.4	72
Parents	95.2	4.8	189
Total			261

APPENDIX 1
PARENTS' SURVEY INSTRUMENT

FORM P

1. What kinds of things do you believe cause some children not to do their best in school?
2. Do any of these things apply to your family and, if so, which ones?
3. (a) Are you aware of any kinds of help available in the schools to help with these types of problems? (b) If yes, have you tried to make use of this help? (c) How did it work out?
4. (a) Have any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools? (b) If yes, what kind of help?
5. (a) Is it possible there has been help available in the schools and you do not know about it? (b) If so, have you tried to find out or do you have any ideas about how to find out what help is available?
6. (a) Who is the first person or what is the first place you would go to seek help for a child having problems with studies or behavior related to school? (b) Do you know of specific programs you could turn to for this help?
7. (a) Do you know of (other) people or places outside the school system where you could go for help? (b) Have you, or has someone you know, used them? (c) Did they help the children? (d) In what ways?
8. (a) What do you think schools should provide for your children as far as their futures are concerned? (b) Where do you feel they succeed and/or fail?
9. (a) Have you attempted to voice your opinion or take some action to make the schools respond in a better way to the needs of your children? (b) If yes, did anyone listen?

Family Characteristics

9. (c) Number of children at home......
(d) Number of school-age children......
(e) Number of children involved in "special" educational programs......
(f) How many parents live at home......
(g) Parents' years of education --- Mother......Father......
(h) Parents' occupations --- Mother............Father............
(i) Yearly income range --- \$0-\$2,500......
\$2,500-\$4,000......
\$4,000-\$5,500......
\$5,500-\$7,000......
Above \$7,000......

10. (a) Which of these types of people do you believe should be most helpful to youngsters who are having problems? (b) To your knowledge, which have, in fact, been most helpful to your children or other children?

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
Superintendent	....	....	....
Principal	....	....	....
Other administrators	....	....	....
Classroom teachers	....	....	....
Guidance counselors	....	....	....
Reading or other "special" teachers	....	....	....

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
School nurses	....	....	....
School board members	....	....	....
Librarians	....	....	....
Aides	....	....	....
Student teachers	....	....	....
Gym teachers or coaches	....	....	....
Other	....	....	....

11. (a) Do you receive any of the following? (b) How do you rate their usefulness, whether or not you receive them?

	Yes	No	Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
Report cards	...	..	......	......	......
Periodic printed information about school affairs	...	..	......	......	......
School newsletters	...	..	......	......	......
Individual reports from teachers	...	..	......	......	......
Individual reports from counselors	...	..	......	......	......
Information on special help available	...	..	......	......	......
Requests for teacher-parent conferences	...	..	......	......	......

12. (a) Have you ever been involved in any of the following? (b) How do you rate their effectiveness?

	Yes	No	Very Effective	Effective	Not Effective
Parent-Teacher Organizations	...	..	....	....	....
Parents nights	...	..	....	....	....
Individual conferences with teachers	...	..	....	....	....
School board meetings	...	..	....	....	....
Attendance in classes	...	..	....	....	....
Meetings with principals	...	..	....	....	....
Organizing parent groups	...	..	....	....	....
Specifically requesting more information	...	..	....	....	....

13. Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (a) Can you add other things to the list? (b) Which of the things on the list do you believe to be:

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible
Good medical care not available	....	....	....
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	....	....	....
Shortage of clothes	....	....	....
Not enough good food	....	....	....
No pre-school education (like kindergarten or Headstart)	....	....	....
Not enough family income	....	....	....
Use of drugs or alcohol	....	....	....

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible
Only one parent in the home	....	....	....
Unemployment	....	....	....
Parents with limited education	....	....	....
Parents' health	....	....	....
Inadequate family transportation	....	....	....

14. Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?

A study schedule for completing homework ......
Help with homework by other family members ......
Encouragement to do well by parents ......
Having reference books and other study aids available......
Frequent good family discussions ......
Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child ......
Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members ......
A happy home ......

15. Following is a list of conditions. (a) How frequently do they occur in school-age children you know? (b) Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Not Frequently	Limiting
Overweight	....	....	....	....
Contagious diseases	....	....	....	....
Mental illness	....	....	....	....
Learning disabilities	....	....	....	....
Retardation	....	....	....	....
Crippling physical handicaps	....	....	....	....
Poor vision	....	....	....	....
Poor hearing	....	....	....	....
Not able to understand what is being taught	....	....	....	....
Physical defects	....	....	....	....
Underweight	....	....	....	....
Emotional nervousness	....	....	....	....

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

	Very Important	Fairly Important	Not Very Important
Graduation from elementary school	....	....	....
Graduation from high school	....	....	....
Learning a trade or work skill	....	....	....
Achieving good grades	....	....	....
Involvement in non-study school activities	....	....	....
Working part time to help the family	....	....	....
Completing study assignments	....	....	....
Learning to get along with others	....	....	....
Taking part in class discussions	....	....	....
Preparing for college	....	....	....

17. (a) What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

Positive...... Neutral...... Negative......

(b) What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

Positive...... Neutral...... Negative......

18. Do you think the schools feel the families of children with problems are "different" in any way?

Yes...... No......

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a child with problems?

Yes...... No......

APPENDIX 2
PROFESSIONALS' SURVEY INSTRUMENT

FORM S

Name ______________________________ Position ______________________________
School or District ______________ City or Town ______________________________

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?
2. (a) Why do some of these problems occur in your view? (b) Are there common home or educational experiences which seem to cause these problems? (c) What are some of the common signals that you feel identify students who need special help? (d) Do you have procedures for seeking out those children whose educational needs are less obvious, the so-called "quiet well-behaved" problem children?
3. Could you list in order of importance the areas of disadvantagement which lead to educational problems?
4. (a) How do you find out about children who are having problems? (b) Are there other ways in which you should find out but don't and, if so, why?
5. What actions do you take once such children come to your attention?
6. Once you have discovered a child or a group of children whose educational needs are not being met how do you work in concert with classroom teachers, specialists, counselors and others to handle the situation?
7. What programs are you aware of or involved in that deal specifically with the educationally disadvantaged child?
8. (a) How have special programs been developed and funded? (b) Have federal funds been useful in this area? (c) Are you free to apply for federal funding when available or needed? (d) How are you informed of various federal programs in this area?
9. (a) What other persons within the school system are most knowledgeable and involved in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged children? (b) Why do you feel that they are knowledgeable? (c) Have they influenced the development of special programs for these children?
10. (a) Are there persons in the community who are knowledgeable about or involved with the needs of educationally disadvantaged children? (b) Who are they? (c) What specific things to your knowledge have they done? (d) Have you referred children to any of them and, if so, which ones?
11. (a) Which of these types of personnel are responsible in your school system for helping children who are having problems? (b) Which types are, *in fact*, most helpful to children with problems?

	Responsible People	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
Superintendent	....	....	....	....
Principal	....	....	....	....
Other administrators	....	....	....	....
Classroom teachers	....	....	....	....
Guidance counselors	....	....	....	....
Reading or other "special" teachers	....	....	....	....
School nurses	....	....	....	....
School board members	....	....	....	....
Librarians	....	....	....	....

	Responsible People	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
Aides	....	....	....	....
Student teachers	....	....	....	....
Gym teachers or coaches	....	....	....	....

12. (a) Are the following methods of communication with families used in your school system? (b) How do you rate their usefulness, whether or not they are used in your school system?

	Yes	No	Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
Report cards	...	..	......	......	......
Periodic printed information about school affairs	...	..	......	......	......
School newsletters	...	..	......	......	......
Individual reports from teachers	...	..	......	......	......
Individual reports from counselors	...	..	......	......	......
Information on special help available	...	..	......	......	......
Requests for teacher-parent conferences	...	..	......	......	......

13. (a) In your school district, do parents become involved in the following activities? (b) How do you rate the effectiveness of such involvement?

	Yes	No	Very Effective	Effective	Not Effective
Parent-Teacher Organizations	...	..	....	....	....
Parents nights	...	..	....	....	....
Individual conferences with teachers	...	..	....	....	....
School board meetings	...	..	....	....	....
Attendance in classes	...	..	....	....	....
Meetings with principals	...	..	....	....	....
Organizing parent groups	...	..	....	....	....
Specifically requesting more information	...	..	....	....	....

13. (c) To what extent do parents of disadvantaged children become involved in these things?

13. (d) Within the disadvantaged parents' group, what do you see as blocks to effective involvement with the problems of their children?

14. Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (a) Can you add other things to the list? (b) Which of the things on the list do you believe to be:

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible
Good medical care not available	....	....	....
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat	....	....	....
Shortage of clothes	....	....	....
Not enough good food	....	....	....

	Very Responsible	Responsible	Not Responsible
No pre-school education (like kindergarten or Headstart)	....	....	....
Not enough family income	....	....	....
Use of drugs or alcohol	....	....	....
Only one parent in the home	....	....	....
Unemployment	....	....	....
Parents with limited education	....	....	....
Parents' health	....	....	....
Family mobility	....	....	....

15. Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school by disadvantaged children?

A study schedule for completing homework	......
Help with homework by other family members	......
Encouragement to do well by parents	......
Having reference books and other study aids available	......
Frequent good family discussions	......
Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child	......
Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members	......
A happy home	......

16. Following is a list of conditions. (a) How frequently are they a factor in educationally disadvantaged school-age children? (b) Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Not Frequently	Limiting
Overweight	....	....	....	....
Contagious diseases	....	....	....	....
Mental Illness	....	....	....	....
Learning disabilities	....	....	....	....
Retardation	....	....	....	....
Crippling physical handicaps	....	....	....	....
Poor vision	....	....	....	....
Poor hearing	....	....	....	....
Physical defects	....	....	....	....
Underweight	....	....	....	....
Emotional nervousness	....	....	....	....

17. (a) What is the attitude of the schools toward the disadvantaged child?

Positive...... Neutral...... Negative......

(b) What is the disadvantaged child's attitude toward the schools?

Positive...... Neutral...... Negative......

18. Can you comment generally on the characteristics of the family of a disadvantaged child?

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a disadvantaged child?

Yes...... No......